

Chief stages in the history of the C. P. S. U.

THIS MODERN WORLD: PART IV *POLITICAL EDUCATION*

This course assumes nothing, except an interest in the why and wherefore of modern working class life. Answers in the plainest possible manner the queries we all want to know about

Crisis and Unemployment, Government, Socialism, the Soviet Union, the political system, the rise of the Bolshevik Party, the history of the Russian Revolution, the teachings of Marx, Engels Lenin and Stalin.

HX
632
A1
W3
No. 1490

MAIN

JOHN LAWRENCE LTD. - SIXPENCE

POLITICAL EDUCATION

PART FOUR

THE CHIEF STAGES IN THE HISTORY OF THE C.P.S.U.



**LONDON
MARTIN LAWRENCE**

Published by Martin Lawrence Ltd., 33 Great James Street, London, W.C.1.
and printed in Great Britain by
Western Printing Services Ltd., Bristol

1935

PART IV

THE CHIEF STAGES IN THE HISTORY OF THE C.P.S.U.

The historical roots of Bolshevism go back to the revolutionary circles which Lenin and his comrades created in the 'nineties of the last century. The organisation and first steps of the work of these revolutionary circles took place in circumstances of continual struggle against both the open enemies of the working class and opportunist tendencies inside the labour movement.

Bolshevism grew up and strengthened itself in the struggle against these enemies. At the dawn of the Russian Labour Movement the biggest part in this struggle was played by the "Union of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class," founded by Lenin in 1895, and by the paper *Iskra* (*The Spark*), founded by him in 1900, which organised the calling of the Second Congress of the party, the Congress at which Bolshevism was born.

"Bolshevism," Lenin said, "exists both as a tendency in political thought and as a political party from 1903."

Bolshevism grew up along with the revolutionary movement of the working class, led and is still leading that movement, has brought it to victory over one-sixth part of the world, and will lead it to victory over the whole world.

Under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, the working class in Russia has carried through three revolutions; one in 1905 and two in 1917. This is such a rich source of revolutionary experience that all the Communist Parties of the world are able learn from it.

The history of the Bolshevik Party *teaches how* to fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for Communism. This is where the *international* importance of the history of the Bolshevik party lies. Lenin wrote that "the Russian example shows every country something or other very essential of their inevitable and not distant future."

Moreover, valuable lessons both for the present leadership of the struggle of the working class and for socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. are to be found embedded in the rich past of the party.

So the study of the history of the party has the most important practical significance. "The history of the Bolshevik Party," Comrade Postyshev has said, "is not simply the archives of the past, but a guide to action, which provides the key to the understanding and solution of the most pressing problems of socialist construction."

In this part we shall dwell briefly on the chief stages in the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (C.P.S.U.).

The part is divided into the following sections:

1. The years of preparation for the first revolution.
2. The years of revolution.
3. The years of reaction.
4. The years of a new rise in the Labour Movement.
5. The years of the imperialist war.
6. From February to October.
7. The years of the Civil War.
8. The restoration period.
9. The reconstruction period.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

THE YEARS OF PREPARATION FOR THE FIRST REVOLUTION

The Classes on the Eve of the Revolution

Lenin characterised the period from 1902-5 as follows :

" The approach of a great storm can everywhere be felt. There is ferment and preparation among all classes."

This was the period of the growth and preparation of the revolution.

At this time a serious economic crisis was developing in Russia, affecting first the textile, and then the metal and coal industries. Tens of thousands of workers were thrown idle. A great number of factories only worked three days a week. Unemployment shook every section of industry. In Moscow two out of every three workers were unemployed. The factory and mine owners tried to use unemployment in order better to squeeze the workers. This called forth a movement of working-class protest which developed into a wide strike movement. In 1903 a general strike broke out in the Ukraine and the Caucasus. The Russo-Japanese war of 1904 called forth in its turn a wave of ferment among the workers and peasant masses. Among the national minorities of the border countries, in the Caucasus, Turkestan, Poland and elsewhere, where the worker and peasant masses particularly felt the weight of the Tsarist yoke, a strong revolutionary ferment set in. Unrest among the peasants assumed wide proportions and began to affect the rank and file of the army. Unrest began in the army and fleet also. The most striking revolutionary movement in the fleet was the mutiny in the armoured cruiser *Potemkin* in 1905. A revolution of the workers and peasants against the Tsarist autocracy began to develop throughout the country.

The Tsarist regime was based chiefly on the class of landlord nobility, which held in its hands the best lands and forests. In Russia the Tsars themselves have always been among the largest landlords and serf-owners, savagely exploiting their peasants. All the best lands covering immense tracts belonged to the Tsar and his relations. The Tsarist family in 1905 owned in European Russia alone sixteen million acres. That is, the Tsar's family owned land equal in area to an average European State. Hundreds of thousands of peasants worked for the Tsar and his relatives in the most terrible conditions of oppression and real slavery. The country paid immense taxes to maintain the whole crowd of court functionaries, Tsarist menials, the palaces and royal estates. Over twelve million gold roubles a year were spent on the upkeep of the Tsar's family alone.

The whole working population hated the Tsar and the whole regime of Tsarist autocracy. It was a regime of real deprivation of all rights and utter exploitation of the toiling masses.

Besides the immense taxes which the whole labouring population of the country paid to the Tsarist Government, the peasantry was also paying vast sums to the landlords in the form of high rents for their lands, pastures, etc.

In addition, the landlord exploited the peasantry by forcing them to work off their debts by using their labour and machinery on his land, by making them give up their harvest to him for a pittance. It is easy to understand that the overwhelming mass of peasantry was poverty-stricken and hungry. One-third of all the peasant farms were without horses, another third had only one horse. Only a small upper section of the peasantry, the kulaks, the rich peasants, lived well.

All the important posts in the government and other institutions were occupied by members of the nobility. So the struggle of the peasants against the landlords was also a struggle against the Tsarist government.

The working class in Russia at the beginning of the twentieth century had already become a sufficiently powerful force to lead and organise the struggle of the peasantry against the landlords and the Tsarist power.

Deep changes were taking place at this time in world capitalist economy. Monopolies were developing, the struggle for markets was breaking out on a wide scale, the fight for re-division of the world was maturing, capitalism had entered its *imperialist* stage of development.

Russian capitalism reached a particularly high stage of development just in this epoch of imperialism. Russian capitalism bound up its interests in the closest way with the interests of European imperialism. Foreign banks poured capital into Russia and penetrated the oil, coal, gold-mining and other industries.

Russian capital along with foreign capital was active in many spheres of industry and trade.

Russian imperialism at this time showed great annexationist tendencies in the East. It was precisely this annexationist policy of Russian imperialism which led to the Russo-Japanese war in 1904.

The working class also grew in Russia along with the growth of capitalism, while the rate of its growth at this time even caught up with the rate of increase of the working class in the U.S.A. But in Tsarist Russia, the workers' lack of all rights, the employers' pressure on them, their savage exploitation, could not in any way compare with the condition of the workers in Europe and America. The workers had to strain at their jobs for twelve, fourteen, and longer hours in a day, for a few pence. The tyranny of the employers and their foremen was terrible. The worker was fined for every trifle, the money being deducted from his wages, and he had to spend his wages in the factory store, where he paid three times as much for rotten goods.

This tyranny, exploitation and very serious lack of all rights for the workers was energetically supported and defended by the Tsar's government. All this intensified the revolutionary discontent of the working masses and made the working class a particularly bitter and consistent enemy of Tsarism. One party explained to the workers that the only way out of the situation lay in the revolutionary overthrow of autocracy. The working class, owing to its revolutionary character, was able to draw the petty bourgeoisie of the towns and the peasantry on to the path of struggle against autocracy.

Of course, the revolutionary feeling of the working class went further than the mere overthrow of Tsarist autocracy. The working class set itself the aim of destroying capitalism and every kind of exploitation.

It was precisely this revolutionary decisiveness of the proletariat that frightened the bourgeoisie, which, though it was discontented with the

Tsarist, landlord, semi-feudal regime, was still more frightened of the growing revolutionary strength of the proletariat. The rule of the landlord-nobility class was hindering the development of industry. The bourgeoisie itself aspired to power and was therefore in favour of replacing the Tsarist regime. But the revolutionary activity of the working class seriously alarmed the bourgeoisie, for it had as its aim not just the overthrow of the autocracy, but the further development of the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and the victory of the proletarian revolution.

Political Tendencies on the Eve of the Revolution

Obviously the different interests of the various classes and the different attitudes of these classes to the approaching revolution caused a profound struggle between the political tendencies and parties which represented and defended the interests of those classes. Lenin said concerning this struggle that it was a "stern struggle of programmes and tactical views," and that it "was anticipated and prepared by the growing, open class struggle."

Three main political tendencies became apparent in this struggle: a bourgeois, a petty-bourgeois, and a proletarian.

The bourgeois parties came out under the flag of liberalism, that is of false bourgeois "love of freedom." These liberal-bourgeois parties from the very beginning of the rise in the revolutionary movement prepared to take power. Frightened by the sweep of the growing revolution, they preferred to obtain concessions from the autocracy by means of compromises and agreements with it, in order in this way to forestall the revolution.

The interests of the petty bourgeoisie were represented by the Mensheviks and so-called Social Revolutionaries (S.R.'s). Both these parties decorated themselves with "socialist" and "revolutionary" labels, but in practice both were the advocates and defenders of the town and country petty bourgeoisie.

The S.R.'s passed themselves off as a "peasant" party, but by their composition they were actually a party of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, while by their class interests and aims they were a kulak party. They made no distinction between the exploited, poor sections of the peasantry and the class of village capitalists—the kulaks. In essence they defended the interests of kulakdom. They were opposed to Marxism and denied the leading role of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement.

The Mensheviks at that time represented the interests of the urban petty bourgeoisie, though they dressed up in Marxist clothes and passed themselves off as a "labour" party.

At this time both Bolsheviks and Mensheviks called themselves social-democrats. This title was not yet a shameful one. The split between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks took place in 1903 at the Second Congress of the Party. The Congress was preceded by a very sharp struggle between the revolutionary and opportunist wings within Russian Marxism. This was the struggle against that opportunist tendency which is well known under the name of "economism." This tendency limited the tasks of the working class simply to *economic struggle*, and kept the workers away from *political struggle*. This tendency advised some such course as this to the worker: "Fight for an extra penny on your pay, for hot water to make tea, but don't bother about politics, for that's a matter for educated persons and the advanced sections of the

bourgeoisie, not for workers." The "economists" consider that the working class is interested only in the improvement of its material position, and not in changing the political system of the State or in the struggle for socialism.

They did not understand that there is no other way for the improvement of the condition of the workers than the overthrow of Tsarist autocracy and the abolition of capitalist exploitation. To achieve this end, the working class must be *politically organised*, it must have its own *political party*, whereas the "economists" opposed any kind of political organisation of the proletariat and were supporters of the *spontaneous* development of the movement, the bearers of the idea of *spontaneity* in the labour movement.

Lenin in *Iskra* carried on a hard fight against this theory of spontaneity, opposing it with the proletarian theory of *conscious and organised* waging of the struggle against autocracy and the bourgeoisie under the leadership of the proletarian party.

But since the "economists" were against the political struggle, they were against the formation of a party. Lenin, on the other hand, put this task first of all and above all, the creation of a party of the working class.

Lenin's struggle against economism had an immense importance for the whole struggle that followed against the Mensheviks and other brands of opportunists (liquidators, right deviation), who came out as preachers of spontaneity and opponents of the Bolshevik principles of organisation and of the party.

The split between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in 1903 was inevitable, since, in fact, the fight was waged around the question of whether the party was to be a proletarian or a petty-bourgeois one. The disagreements between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks affected all the fundamental questions of party policy. This was the struggle between the policy of the revolutionary proletariat and the policy of the petty bourgeoisie.

Especially sharp were the disagreements around the first point in the party constitution.

This point defined who might be considered a member of the party. The Menshevik leader Martov demanded that everyone who supported the party by paying a subscription, who agreed with the programme and gave it help, should be considered a member. Lenin insisted that only those should be considered party members who accepted the programme, paid subscriptions and *personally participated in the work of one of the party organisations*.

What was the meaning of this disagreement?

To-day every party member, every candidate, every member of the Young Communist League, every Pioneer even, knows there can be no such thing as a member of the party who does not belong to a party cell and carry out party work. But at that time, thirty years ago, Lenin still had to fight for the recognition of this form of party organisation.

He immediately put forward a clear, precise programme of how a party should be constructed which wishes to lead the working class politically.

Lenin attacked Martov because he clearly recognised that there can be no such thing as a party member outside a party organisation. In such a party as Martov wanted there can be no discipline, no centralised leadership, no unity.

But Martov and his fellow-thinkers were afraid of just these things, discipline and centralised leadership. They considered that the party should

open its doors wide for the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intelligentsia. So they insisted that there should be no binding of every party member to compulsory participation in party work under the leadership of the local organisation. They were afraid that to accept Lenin's proposal would mean frightening the professors, the little gentlemen, the lawyers who "sympathised" with Marxism, but did not want to bind themselves by any discipline.

Lenin was not thinking about professors, but about the workers, whom he wished to unite in one party.

So the dispute about the first point in the constitution at once showed two different approaches to the party. The *Leninist* approach meant the creation of a party of a *new* type, built on the basis of the unity of revolutionary theory and practice, with strong proletarian discipline, with a working-class composition, whose task was the revolutionary overthrow of Tsarism, the abolition of capitalist exploitation and the construction of classless socialist society. *Martov's* approach meant the creation of a party similar in type to the parties of the Second International, in which the gulf between theory and practice is natural; parties without any organisational backbone; crumbling organisations of petty-bourgeois intellectuals whose aim is an agreement with the bourgeoisie, that is to say, a denial of the proletarian revolution.

In face of the approaching revolutionary events, a deep gulf at once became apparent between these two conceptions of the tasks of the party of the proletariat. There was not a single political question which did not bring out the disagreement between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. Here were two different approaches to the tasks of the working class in the approaching revolution, the *proletarian* approach which the Bolsheviks defended, and the *petty-bourgeois* approach which the Mensheviks supported.

The elections to the different organs of the party at the Second Congress gave Lenin a majority, while Martov was in the minority. Hence the names "Bolshevik" (majority) and "Menshevik" (minority).

From the very beginning, right from the time of the Second Congress, Bolshevism and Menshevism were not merely two different tendencies, but in fact two different parties. How deep the political disagreements and organisational split had gone, we can see best of all from the fact that in the circumstances of the growing revolution, the Mensheviks did not appear at all at the Third Congress of the party (in May 1905), but called their own conference separately, which opposed its decisions to the Bolshevik decisions of the Third Congress.

The fundamental question in these disputes between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries was with regard to the tactics to be employed in the approaching revolution, *as to which class was to be the leading force in the revolution.*

The Mensheviks and with them the S.R.'s considered that the coming revolution should lead to the formation of such a bourgeois system as exists in European capitalist countries, as for example, in France. So, according to the Mensheviks and S.R.'s, after the revolution in Russia the capitalist class must come to power. The Mensheviks and S.R.'s dreamed of the creation of a bourgeois parliament and of further peaceful co-operation with the bourgeoisie, or at most of playing at a parliamentary opposition.

The Bolsheviks had an absolutely different estimate of the situation and

tasks of the revolution. The immediate task of the revolution, said the Bolsheviks, was the overthrow of the Tsarist autocracy and the establishment of a *revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry*.

Let us see what that means.

The revolution had to be directed against the autocracy and the relics of feudalism, that is against the system of harsh enslavement of the peasantry by the landlords; against the system of terrible deprivation of rights for the labouring masses, on the one hand, and the great privileges and advantages of the "upper" classes on the other, that is of the nobility, aristocracy, Tsarist bureaucracy and clergy; against the system of savage and unlimited power for the Tsar and his gendarmes, and the oppression of the worker and peasant masses; against the system of oppression by the Great-Russian nation of all the other peoples living in the Russian Empire.

Such a revolution, which leads to the overthrow of the autocratic monarchy, of the power of the landlords, and to the destruction of the relics of feudalism, is called *bourgeois-democratic*.

What classes in Russia were interested in the bourgeois-democratic revolution? First of all the working class. The regime of landlord feudal rule was a regime of the harshest political and economic suppression of the proletariat. So the working class was particularly interested in the overthrow of this regime. But the overthrow of Tsarist autocracy was only the immediate and transitional task of the proletariat. Its chief task was the overthrow of the capitalist system, the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship and a further struggle for the complete victory of Communism—the ultimate aim of the working class. Russia was a country with an overwhelmingly peasant population. In order to reach Communism quickly the working class was interested in creating a system which would allow it to organise successfully its forces, to gather round itself the wide masses of the peasantry and carry on a struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and for socialism.

The *peasantry* was also interested in a bourgeois-democratic revolution, since it was suffering severely from the oppression of the landlords' exploitation and trying to get rid of this oppression. But it could only get rid of the landlords' exploitation if the power of the landlord-nobility were overthrown. The peasantry saw that the only force which would go right to the end in the overthrow of the landlords' yoke was the working class, and so in its revolutionary fight with the autocracy it followed the workers.

In so far as it was a question of overthrowing the power of the landlords the bourgeoisie was also partially interested in the revolution, since it was important for it to get political power in its hands and create the conditions for a rapid development of capitalism. Nevertheless, the bourgeoisie was very closely connected with the landlord class and the Tsar's government, having landed property and receiving government orders for its factories.

The Russian bourgeoisie was afraid of a revolutionary change, and so in 1905 Lenin already estimated the bourgeoisie as a *counter-revolutionary force*.

Consequently only the working class in alliance with the peasantry could finally solve the task of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Its task consisted in establishing, after it had overthrown the autocracy, the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

On the Transformation of the Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution into a Socialist one

The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the working class and peasantry had to put an end to the relics of feudalism and lay the foundations for the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the proletarian-socialist revolution. The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry is not the end of the revolutionary struggle—it has merely a transitory, preparatory significance in the struggle for socialism. Lenin constructed his theory of the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution on the basis of the teaching of Marx and Engels.

Lenin said that a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship means the organisation not of a system, but of a war, that is to say, the development of a further struggle for the abolition of private property, for the overthrow of the exploiting classes, for the abolition of exploitation, for the establishment of proletarian dictatorship, for socialism.

“With all our force we will help all the peasantry to make a democratic revolution, *so that it may be easier for us*, the party of the proletariat, to advance as quickly as possible to a new and higher task, to the socialist revolution. We shall at once begin to pass,” Lenin wrote in 1905, “from the democratic revolution in accordance with the extent of our strength, the strength of the conscious and organised proletariat; we shall begin to pass to the socialist revolution.”

The Mensheviks, as we have said, rejected all thoughts of transforming the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one. They considered that the revolution must be a *bourgeois* one and that the revolution should finish at that stage. But if that were so, *then the chief motive force in the revolution would be the bourgeoisie*. The liberal bourgeoisie must lead the revolution, while the working class must support it, and push it forward. The working class must act in concert with them and not frighten them by their revolutionary activity.

The Bolsheviks, of course, rejected this Menshevik programme for the revolution. The Bolsheviks viewed the revolution of 1905 as bourgeois-democratic in its immediate aims, but as proletarian in its methods (the means for carrying it through). They declared that the working class must stand at the helm of the revolution. The Bolsheviks saw the ally of the working class not in the bourgeoisie, but in the peasantry.

The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, meant the alliance of the proletariat with the whole mass of the peasantry, in so far as it was interested as a whole in the destruction of the landlords' oppression. But as we have seen, the peasantry is not uniform. There are poor peasants and middle-class peasants, and there are the kulaks.

In proportion as the bourgeois-democratic revolution becomes transformed into the proletarian-socialist revolution, the whole mass of the peasantry no longer fully supports the struggle of the working class, but only the village poor. The kulaks quickly go over to the side of counter-revolution. The mass of middle-class peasants awaits the result of the struggle. The middle-class peasant is at one and the same time both a property owner and a toiler. He stands at the parting of the ways. Either it is better for him to go with

the class of big property owners, the bourgeoisie, or he finds it more profitable to march with the proletariat and peasant poor. Since the middle-class peasants in the course of the struggle for proletarian dictatorship hesitate between the proletariat and bourgeoisie, the working class is interested in seeing that these middle peasants should at least not fight *against* them, or, as it is put in another way, they they should remain *neutral*. After the victory of the proletarian revolution, when the middle-class peasantry, as the result of correct leadership by the proletariat and its party, becomes convinced of the advantages of the proletarian dictatorship, it comes over to the side of the revolution, becomes the ally of the proletariat.

The Mensheviks, however, rejected every idea of the working class being a force capable of organising the peasantry, rejected any kind of revolutionary significance in the peasantry. The Mensheviks declared that the peasantry can only hinder and not help the revolution. They saw in the peasantry only the adversary of the working class and not its ally. They believed that the peasantry was a *reactionary* force, a hindrance. But they considered the liberal bourgeoisie, on the other hand, to be a *progressive* revolutionary force.

The Mensheviks argued that the main task of the revolution consisted in guaranteeing the coming to power of the bourgeoisie, after which the revolution would be over. In the opinion of the Mensheviks, the task of the bourgeois-democratic revolution consisted in this only.

The Russian Mensheviks were no exception among the opportunists of the world. They all of them distorted the teaching of Marx without pity. Lenin wrote that the opportunists of the world do not understand "the relationship between the bourgeois-democratic and proletarian-socialist revolutions. The first is transformed into the second. The second incidentally solves the problems of the first. The second consolidates the work of the first. Struggle and struggle alone will decide how far the second will succeed in transforming the first."

The victory of the revolution and the achievement of the democratic dictatorship of proletariat and peasantry only become possible as a result of armed revolt. The Tsarist power had a vast apparatus of police, gendarmerie and military at its disposal. Every manifestation of discontent from the workers and peasants was cruelly suppressed by shootings, Cossack whips, massacres, arrests, penal servitude. Only an armed revolt could overthrow the bloody, greedy and cruel power of Tsarism. So the Bolsheviks stood for the preparation of the working class and peasantry for armed revolt. They created workers' detachments, who prepared the working-class masses for armed action. The Mensheviks opposed armed revolt. They expressed the hope that things might pass off "without bloodshed," that mere threats would suffice, that simple agitation in the army and the inclination of the soldiers towards the revolution would be enough to make the Tsarist government yield power to the bourgeoisie of its own accord.

Trotsky occupied a special position in these disputes. While remaining a Menshevik, he spared no pains to throw dirt at the Bolsheviks and Lenin. After the Second Congress Trotsky carried on a frantic struggle against Leninism working out a whole system of Menshevik views on the role of the party. This system of views lay at the root of the whole consequent struggle of the opportunists against the Bolshevik Party.

Over the revolution of 1905, Trotsky came out with a special theory which outwardly appeared very "revolutionary," although in essence it was the purest *Menshevism*. Trotsky tried to show that the working class would have the peasantry among its class enemies, along with the landlords and bourgeoisie. He saw the peasantry as a completely counter-revolutionary force. Trotsky's special theory consisted in showing that the revolution of 1905 would bring the working class to power without the participation and help of the peasantry. This attitude of Trotsky towards the peasantry arose from his denial of the capacity of the working class in Russia to lead the peasantry and convert it into a revolutionary force. This was the general view of all the *Mensheviks*. Trotsky merely expressed this *Menshevik* view in special form, covering it up, as during all the following years, with "left" phrases.

Trotsky explained this view theoretically as that of the so-called "permanent" revolution. This theory fundamentally distorted the Marxist theory of revolution. The theory consisted in the idea that the working class alone, without allies, should come to power immediately after the overthrow of the Tsar. "No Tsar and a labour government," was Trotsky's slogan. At the same time he said that there is no foundation for believing that the working class could remain in power unless the *international revolution* supported the Russian working class against the landlords, capitalists and *peasantry*.

But since nobody can give the workers a guarantee that the world revolution will take place immediately, what conclusion can be drawn from this? Only this, that so long as there is no guarantee, it is useless and senseless to accomplish the revolution. So it follows that behind Trotsky's apparently "revolutionary" slogan, "no Tsar and a labour government," there was in practice concealed a renunciation of the revolution.

Whereas we already know that the chief forces of the revolution of 1905 directed against Tsarism and feudalism were the *working class and peasantry*. Therefore the *Bolsheviks* sharply attacked Trotsky's theory, *fighting for the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of these classes under the leadership of the working class*.

The *Bolsheviks* showed that it was impossible to wait for the revolution until the Western European proletariat guaranteed "State support" for the Russian revolution, that this meant mistrust in the forces of the working class in Russia itself. Lenin pointed out that *the Russian revolution must itself begin the unleashing of the world revolution*. It has to be remembered that the revolution of 1905 took place in circumstances in which capitalism had already entered its highest stage, the stage of imperialism.

Lenin wrote that the Russian revolution must "set Europe on fire" with the flame of international revolution and that the working class of Russia must "not expect Europe to take fire of itself, not wait for the European working class to take power in its hands and come to our aid."

Lenin further pointed out that the slogans of the party must not merely be calculated "in case of carrying the revolution into Europe, but for such a transference."

With the denial of the capacity of the working class to lead also the peasantry along a revolutionary course, is connected the Trotskyist denial of the socialist character of the November revolution of 1917, and the possibility of building socialism in one country.

So both the *Mensheviks* and Trotsky saw the peasantry as a force acting

not for but *against* the revolution, and rejected the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, and its transformation into a socialist revolution.

Consequently the Bolsheviks in 1905 had to wage a struggle on two fronts: against the open opportunism of the Mensheviks, calling for the full transfer of power to the bourgeoisie, and against the false, "left" theories of Trotsky, which babbled about the formation of working-class power without the participation of the peasantry, and in fact denied the revolution, rejected the alliance of the working class with the peasantry and the idea of the leadership by the proletariat of the peasantry.

II

THE YEARS OF REVOLUTION

From the General Strike to the Revolutionary Revolt

The revolution of 1905 gave all classes the opportunity of checking in practice the correctness of their views and theories. All the disputes between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks found their solution in the course of the revolutionary events. All classes enriched their experience of struggle. Lenin said concerning this period :

" In this period each month, in the sense of teaching the fundamentals of political science to the masses, the leaders, the classes and parties, was equal to a year of ' peaceful,' ' constitutional ' development."

The first wave of revolution swept over the country in connection with the events of January 9th, 1905. On that day the workers of St. Petersburg, together with their wives and children, carrying holy banners and portraits of the Tsar, went to the Winter Palace, in order to present to the Tsar a petition for the improvement of the condition of the workers. This procession was organised by the priest, Gapon, an agent of the Tsarist secret police. In fear of the rapid growth of revolutionary feeling among the masses the Tsarist government was trying hard at this time to plant its police organisations among the workers, in order to turn them away from the really revolutionary organisations of the proletariat. It must be mentioned that in their petition to the Tsar the workers also included a number of demands from the programme of the Bolshevik Party. Gapon was forced to agree to them because even then the programme of the Bolsheviks was fairly widely known to the working masses. The petition was drawn up with all kinds of " faithful subject " expressions and began in this way : " We, the workers of the city of St. Petersburg, our wives, children and aged, helpless parents, have come to you, our sovereign, in search of the truth and of protection."

But at the Winter Palace the workers were met with the volleys of the Tsar's guards. Over a thousand were killed and many more were wounded. This outburst of firing on a peaceful demonstration killed all faith in the Tsar and all the workers' illusions concerning the possibility of improving their condition peacefully, without revolution. The events of January 9th evoked a wave of indignation among the workers and labouring masses all over the country and sharply increased the revolutionary movement in town and country.

In the towns mass strikes, demonstrations and conflicts with the police and military took place. Economic strikes were transformed into political strikes, and in turn transformed into revolts. The movement in the towns was linked up with revolutionary acts of the peasantry in the country. In the national minority regions in the borderlands the revolutionary movement assumed wide proportions, especially in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Finland and the Caucasus. Under the influence of the revolutionary work of the Bolshevik Party, and of the general upsurge in town and country, there also began a revolutionary ferment in the army.

The highest point of the revolution of 1905 was reached when a general political strike broke out, which in Moscow in December was transformed into an armed revolt. Workers' detachments sprang up in the suburbs. By all and every means the workers got arms, even making daggers and pistols for themselves. The rumour ran from the regiments that the soldiers would not fire on the workers. The military forces which were preparing to go over to the side of the workers were disarmed by the Tsarist government. Barricades quickly appeared. The workers' detachments occupied the stations, and opened fire on the police, who disappeared. The Governor, Dubasov, hid himself in the Kremlin. Moscow became like a dead city and all traffic stopped in the streets. The factories and railroads came to a standstill, all except the Nikolaevsk line to St. Petersburg. This line conveyed the drunken soldiers of the Semionov Regiment, who savagely suppressed the revolt with cannon and machine-guns, spilling blood in the streets of Moscow.

The working class occupied the leading position in the revolution of 1905. The bourgeoisie were terrified by the growth of the revolutionary movement, as it embraced millions and millions of workers and peasants. A powerful wave of strikes and peasant risings, the growing armed revolts of the workers in the towns and particularly the revolt in Moscow, finally threw the bourgeoisie into the camp of the counter-revolution. The bourgeoisie, as the Bolsheviks had foretold, moved away from the revolution, went right over to the side of the autocracy, went into the counter-attack against the revolution.

At the moment of greatest revolutionary activity of the working class, the peasantry was still insufficiently organised and was very far behind the revolutionary movement. The Bolshevik Party led the working class. But Tsarism was still strong, the police regime raged mercilessly through the country. The party was compelled to overcome immense obstacles in its course of winning over the masses. The persecution of the party was savage.

The working class is well-organised when it has a Bolshevik Party at its head, based on the different organisations within the working class. But when the revolution began the organisations of the working class were extremely weak, most of them being still in embryo. The Soviets (councils) of workers' deputies which arose in the process of the revolution as organs for the leadership of the struggle of the proletariat, did not succeed in making connections with the peasantry. The Menshevik Trotsky was at the head of the Petersburg Soviet. With his attitude towards the peasantry as a *reactionary* force it was naturally impossible to expect any steps in the direction of contact with the peasantry or leadership over them.

The Bolsheviks at once realised how immensely important the Soviets

of workers' deputies must be under correct revolutionary leadership. The Soviets were already organs of revolutionary power in the first revolution. But weak Soviets, which moreover in many towns were in the hands of the Mensheviks, could not lead the struggle for the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

This fact and the treachery of the liberal bourgeoisie, which acted in conjunction with the Tsarist government, supported by foreign capital, against the revolution, gave the autocracy the opportunity of emerging unscathed from the revolution.

Armed risings in Moscow and elsewhere (in Latvia, Georgia, the Don Basin, etc.), were crushed because the workers were still badly armed and insufficiently organised. The only conclusion to be drawn from this was that the party must get better arms for the workers, create strong detachments, learn the art of street fighting, etc. And so the Bolsheviks prepared for new class battles, for a new armed uprising. The Mensheviks became despondent.

Plekhanov best of all expressed the Mensheviks' attitude to revolt when he declared: "It would have been better not to take up arms." Lenin rejected this conclusion of Plekhanov's with indignation.

"On the contrary," Lenin wrote, "we should have taken up arms more decisively, energetically, offensively, we should have explained to the masses that peaceful strikes alone were impossible and that it was essential to wage a fearless, merciless armed struggle."

The Mensheviks drew the conclusion that an uprising was in general unnecessary, since it was anyhow bound to be beaten. The Bolsheviks drew a different conclusion: it was necessary to prepare an armed rising in a better organised manner. Lenin emphasised that it is especially necessary to carry on revolutionary propaganda in the army, among the soldiers, that it is necessary "to fight for the army." He called for the energetic preparation of armed struggle.

"Who is against it," wrote Lenin, "who does not prepare for it, should be mercilessly thrown out from among the supporters of the revolution, thrown out to its opponents, to the traitors and cowards."

The Attitude of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks to the Tsarist Duma

In the period of revolutionary pressure the Tsarist government was compelled to "make a gift to the people" of the appearance of "freedom," that is of a certain possibility of organising meetings, publishing workers' papers and journals, creating trade unions etc. The Tsar was compelled to take the course of forming a half-baked parliament, of creating the State Duma, arranging the elections in such a fashion that no one but landlords, priests, merchants and big capitalists could get into it.

The Tsarist government did not succeed immediately in suppressing the revolution. 1906-07 were years of prolonged revolutionary struggle during which the government had to put up with the existence of a legal revolutionary press, to allow meetings, etc.

During this period, the Bolsheviks continued to work at the organisation of revolution activity among the working-class masses, whilst the Mensheviks buried the revolution. The Mensheviks argued that the revolution was over

and that it was necessary to adjust oneself to the new conditions. The Bolsheviks, on the other hand, showed that the revolution was not finished yet. True it had not been possible to overthrow the autocracy; the landlords as before were still the ruling class. But the only conclusion to draw from this was that it was necessary to preserve the revolutionary forces, to preserve and strengthen at any cost the party organisation; in a word, not to lower the flag, but to reform the ranks speedily and continue the fight.

In 1906 the Mensheviks at once began to prepare for the elections to the State Duma. The Mensheviks looked upon work in the State Duma as a most important task for them. They dreamed of beginning to work in the same way as the other Social-Democratic parties in Europe, that is to say, *without any illegal organisation*, but only worrying about their seats in parliament and making speeches.

The Bolsheviks argued that in the continuation of a revolutionary situation, not the Duma was the next task, but the preparation of new *rising*. For the Duma, in the hands of the bourgeoisie and landlords, was a means of diverting revolutionary energy. With the help of the Duma Tsarism was aiming to break the revolutionary wave. Consequently, it was necessary *to wage an obstinate struggle against* the deception of the people which the Tsarist autocracy was preparing, *and not to support it*, as the Mensheviks did. So long as the revolutionary wave was still high it was necessary to prepare the working masses for fresh struggles, and not to distract them from the revolutionary movement by the bustle of elections.

So the Bolsheviks prepared a fresh general strike, new revolutionary manifestations.

While the Mensheviks were playing at parliament, the Bolsheviks organised the masses for further revolutionary struggle. They used the election meetings in order to turn them into workers' meetings. At these meetings the Bolsheviks spoke against the Tsarist government, against the Duma, proposed to the workers they should *boycott* the elections, and in place of them organise open mass demonstrations, with a general strike at the opening of the Duma.

The treacherous behaviour of the liberal bourgeoisie and the Mensheviks weakened the further development of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. The First Duma in the main consisted of representatives of the industrial and trading bourgeoisie, headed by the party of Miliukov, the Kadets.* But even this Duma was too "left" for the Tsar's government.

The Tsar therefore quickly dissolved it. The Tsar's government began to go over to the offensive against the revolution, basing itself on the support of the bourgeoisie. At this time (the end of 1906 and beginning of 1907) a certain decline was felt in the revolutionary wave. In these circumstances it was no longer right to continue the preparation of an immediate armed revolt, so there was no longer any point in continuing the boycott of the Duma elections.

The party therefore decided to use the elections to the Second Duma in 1907 for the exposure to the masses of the counter-revolutionary character of the liberal bourgeoisie, and for the propaganda of the revolutionary slogans of the party.

At a conference called at the close of 1907, Lenin proposed a resolution in which he emphasised that the Bolsheviks renounced the boycott, not

* The Russian initials of the party's name—"Constitutional Democrats."

for the purpose of counter-revolutionary babbling in the Duma, but in order to continue in new circumstances and by new methods, their former revolutionary work and agitation.

Why did the Bolsheviks consider it necessary first to boycott the Tsarist Duma, and then recognise that it was essential to participate in the elections? The boycott of the Duma immediately after the December barricades in Moscow was correct, because the revolutionary wave had not yet declined and it was necessary to prepare for fresh revolutionary demonstrations and activities. But when the decline in the revolutionary wave had begun, it would have been a mistake not to use for Bolshevik propaganda the chance with which the elections to the Duma and the Duma itself provided the party.

The Mensheviks saw no difference between the position when the revolution was still on the up grade, and the position when the period of decline had set in. They were attracted by the electoral hubbub from the beginning and began a course of agreements, of common action with the liberal bourgeoisie in the shape of the Kadet party.

The revolution of 1905 called forth and spurred on the revolutionary movement in the West. Street demonstrations took place in Vienna, the Austrian capital, and in another Austrian city, Prague, things went as far as barricades. 1905 started a revolutionary movement in the East also (in China, Turkey, and Persia).

The position of the Bolsheviks in the revolution of 1905 of course caused all the opportunists in European Social-Democracy to attack them. But the revolution also brought forth support from the best, most revolutionary elements in the Second International. The left wing grew stronger, and included Clara Zetkin, Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring and others.

The Bolsheviks emerged from the revolution of 1905 enriched with a wide experience of revolutionary struggle, an experience which was particularly useful during the revolution of 1917.

Lenin unceasingly and in detail studied this experience of the first Russian revolution. He saw in it a "dress rehearsal," a trial of strength for the future victorious revolution of the proletariat.

III

THE YEARS OF REACTION

On the Co-ordination of Legal and Illegal Methods of Struggle

The revolution was crushed. The Tsarist autocracy remained. Overcoming its panic, it changed from a policy of concessions and retreat to the offensive. The Tsarist police force began to rage with particular energy. Mass arrests and exilings followed; the prisons and penal settlements were packed with worker revolutionaries. The Cossack whip ruled. The revolution was suppressed.

The years of reaction, of political decline, began. The legal organisations of the workers were broken up, the revolutionary press was closed down. The Tsarist government was furious, smashing up all social organisations, carrying out mass arrests of workers and revolutionaries. The gallows, fetters,

whips, torture in prison, abuse of prisoners, exile and shooting—these are the characteristics of the Tsarist regime during these years.

But this period was also a revolutionary school for the Communist Party and the working class. A revolutionary class must not only know how to make a good attack, but also how to retreat in organised fashion, so as to take the force out of the enemy's attack and prepare for a new offensive.

"The revolutionary parties must supplement their knowledge," Lenin wrote about this period in 1922. "They have learned how to attack. Now they have to understand that this science has to be supplemented by the science of how to retreat correctly. They have to understand and a revolutionary class learns from its own bitter experience, how to understand that it is impossible to win without learning to attack correctly and retreat correctly. Of all the defeated oppositions and revolutionary parties the Bolsheviks retreated in the greatest order, with the smallest losses to their 'army,' best preserving its core with the least splits either in depth or in the possibility of healing them, with the least demoralisation, with the greatest capability of renewing their work more widely, correctly and energetically."

Why did the Bolshevik Party succeed in retreating with the least losses? Because the party in the conditions of Tsarist reaction nevertheless succeeded in finding a way to the masses by making use both of its underground and its open legal organisations.

In the years of reaction the tendency prevailed among the Mensheviks to demand the complete liquidation and destruction of the party. This tendency was christened "*liquidationism*."

The views of the liquidators were as follows: The revolution has suffered a defeat; it is no use counting upon a new upsurge, therefore it is necessary to reform simply for legal work permitted by the government, while the illegal organisations must be dispersed and liquidated; that is, all the underground organisations of the party must be destroyed, all connection with the working masses broken, and work confined simply to the State Duma. In practice the liquidators were demanding *complete compromise with the regime of Tsarist autocracy*, allowing a struggle with it only in so far as it was within the framework of legality, within the limits permitted by Tsarist law.

In coming out with these proposals, the Menshevik liquidators were acting openly as the direct agents of the bourgeoisie within the working class. It was important for the bourgeoisie that the working class should not be organised for new revolutionary struggle, that it should not have its own revolutionary party. The Menshevik liquidators undertook the fulfilment of this command of the bourgeoisie.

There is no need to say that the Bolsheviks gave the severest repulse to this point of view of the liquidators. They declared a merciless war on liquidationism and came forward decisively in defence of the party and against all efforts to destroy the organisations created with such difficulty in conditions of savage police persecution.

The party had at the same time to carry on a most merciless struggle with tendencies in its own ranks which came out against the utilisation of legal possibilities, against participation in the State Duma, for its boycott at all costs, insisting only on underground methods of party work.

To have taken the course which this "left" tendency was urging, would

have been a most serious mistake for the party. *The success of the party depended on its ability to carry on simultaneously both legal and illegal work.* The liquidators' course was simply helping the bourgeoisie. The destruction of the party in the name of legal work permitted by the law would have been an advantage to the Tsarist government itself. But it would have been no less harmful to the cause of the working class to have renounced legal methods of work. In these years of reaction it would have been a mistake to boycott the Duma, and not to fight for workers' insurance, the trade unions, etc. A party of the working class which struggles for the masses and does not just play at spillikins has to make use of all means in order to be in close touch with the masses. Since election meetings, sick clubs and so on allowed the party to be in touch with the masses it would have been a crime not to make good use of these roads to the masses. Since the Duma was a place in which it was possible, although with limitations, to come out and speak against the Tsarist autocracy, to expose the cowardice of the bourgeoisie and all the tricks of the enemies of the working class, it was necessary to make use of the platform of the Duma. The speeches of the Bolshevik Duma members were printed as leaflets and distributed among the workers.

Not for nothing did the party fight so mercilessly against this "left" group (to which Bogdanov, Lunacharsky, Pokrovsky, Krassin, and others belonged), even to the point of expelling them.

This group was known in the party by the name of boycottists (from the slogan for the *boycott*), of recallists (from the slogan of the *recall* of the Bolsheviks from the Duma), and also of Forwardites (from the name of the paper *Forward*), which they issued at this time abroad.

So during the years of reaction as during the revolution of 1905, the Bolsheviks in their struggle for the party had to fight on two fronts, on the "right" against liquidationism and on the "left" against recallism.

IV

THE YEARS OF A NEW RISE IN THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Struggle for the Party, the Struggle for the Masses

After several years of reaction there began in the middle of 1910 a fresh revolutionary rise in the mass movement.

Industry entered on a period of considerable liveliness. Trusts and syndicates grew. Foreign capital flowed in. Russian capital became closely intertwined with foreign capital.

During the reaction the strike wave had fallen greatly. Whereas in 1905 over three million people participated in various strikes, in the first half of 1910 only about 50,000 took part in strikes. Nevertheless, commencing with the second half of 1910 the strike wave again grew, and the number of *political* strikes rose swiftly. The frightful regime of Tsarist autocracy had become a terrible oppression of the masses. The police terror raged in the most unbridled form.

The Tsarist regime became so hated by the masses that in spite of the harshest persecution by the police demonstrations and mass strikes had again

commenced by the middle of 1910. By this time the workers' newspaper, *Zvezda* (*The Star*), began to appear, directed by the Bolshevik members of the Duma. On the 5th May, 1912, the daily Bolshevik newspaper *Pravda* (*The Truth*) appeared. Lenin directed this paper from abroad. Comrade Stalin was its editor. Despite a frequent persecution by the Tsarist authorities, the newspaper fought in a militant way for the Bolshevik slogans and brought these slogans to the widest masses of the workers. The shooting of 270 workers at the Lena Goldfields in 1912 at once raised the wave of political strikes very high. A new movement began against the Tsarist autocracy. It had to be led, there had to be a strong revolutionary party of the proletariat, there had to be good organisation of the masses. But the liquidators were against the party, and as before fawned on the liberal bourgeoisie; they came out with attacks on the Bolsheviks and on adherence to the party in bourgeois newspapers, and eventually in their liquidators' newspaper *Luch* (*The Ray*) they carried on a campaign of slander against the Bolsheviks and against *Pravda*.

In 1912 the Bolsheviks called a conference at Prague (now in Czechoslovakia). At this conference they elected a new Central Committee composed only of Bolsheviks and finally expelled all liquidators, boycotters and Trotskyists from their ranks. Right from 1903 Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, although they were two different parties constantly fighting each other, had at various times formally had a common Central Committee. The Prague conference put an end to this. The Bolshevik Party finally severed even formal connection with the Menshevik Party. Trotsky tried at this time to occupy a special position somewhere in between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, but in actual practice came out on the side of the Mensheviks against Lenin and Bolshevism. Trotsky declared that he stood "outside all fractions," but in fact he acted together with the Mensheviks and with all the enemies and adversaries of Bolshevism, carrying on a continual foul slander against Lenin and the Bolshevik Party.

Trotskyism has always been distinguished by its special capacity for waging a struggle against Lenin and the Bolsheviks, using the most unprincipled methods. Trotsky tried in 1912 to build up a united front (the so-called *August Bloc*) of all the adversaries of Bolshevism, starting with the liquidators and finishing with the recallists and the supporters of the paper *Forward* (the so-called *Vperiodovtsi*). He collected together all the most variegated groups and cliques under the flag of the struggle against Bolshevism. Whatever the disagreements between these groups, they had to be forgotten in the name of the struggle against Bolshevism. This was what Trotsky was giving all his efforts to at the very time when the Bolsheviks were carrying on an intense struggle for the party against both "Right" wing and "Left" wing efforts to liquidate it.

This little plot of course turned out to be an attempt based on unsuitable methods, since it is impossible to create any kind of stable organisation if it has no principles and is deprived of any common fundamental ideas and is composed of a variety of groups and cliques. Inevitably this bloc fell to pieces. Lenin said of this bloc of Trotsky's that it was all the worse "the more cunningly, more effectively and more wordily" it covered up its anti-party essence.

The Bolsheviks led the strike struggles of the workers. The Mensheviks

came out against strikes, accusing the Bolsheviks of fomenting a "strike gamble." In fulfilling the will of their master the bourgeoisie, the Menshevik liquidators poured dirty water on the Bolshevik Party and the newspaper *Pravda*. In this period, however, the Bolsheviks and *Pravda* were fighting with unweakened consistency for the following three slogans, which in *Pravda* were called the "Three Whales": "The Overthrow of the Autocracy," "the eight-hour working day," and "the confiscation of the landlords' lands."

In the struggle for these slogans, cleverly applying their tactic of using both legal and illegal methods of work, the Bolsheviks firmly won over the masses of the workers to their side.

The party was able to expose the Mensheviks as acting as agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement. The bourgeoisie backed up the Mensheviks by every means in their struggle with the Bolsheviks. But the Mensheviks did not succeed in winning back again the positions conquered by the Bolsheviks within the working class.

Lenin wrote in connection with this:

"The Bolsheviks *could not* have maintained . . . the firm core of a revolutionary party of the proletariat from 1908 to 1914, if they had not insisted during the bitterest struggles on the *obligation* of uniting illegal and legal methods of struggle."

During 1913-14 the strike movement was swiftly transformed into open revolutionary demonstrations. Barricades appeared on the streets of St. Petersburg. A continual wave of political strikes was accompanied by revolutionary unrest in the villages. Mass workers' demonstrations began, becoming in the summer of 1914 transformed into serious conflicts with the police. Matters were again approaching a revolutionary uprising. The Bolshevik Party all the time led this revolutionary movement of the working-class masses.

Bolshevism in the International Field

While leading the revolutionary movement of the workers inside their own country, and waging an unceasing struggle with Russian opportunism in all its forms, the Bolsheviks fought energetically for the revolutionary ideas of Marx and Engels inside the international working-class movement, against the opportunist leaders of the Second International.

From the very first days of the formation of the Bolshevik Party it carried on an uncompromising struggle, not only with Russian, but also with International Menshevism. The Bolsheviks entered into a struggle of ideas against the leaders of German Social-Democracy and the Second International, sharply exposed and criticised their opportunist ideas and actions, and decisively fought against all varieties of opportunism. At the same time the Bolsheviks also came out against left social-democracy (Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Radek, and others), which did not have the courage to break with its own Mensheviks. As far back as 1903 and 1904 Lenin, in fighting with the Russian Mensheviks, also managed to bring about a break between the left social-democrats in Germany, and throughout the Second International, and their opportunist leaders. While fighting against unconcealed opportunism the Bolsheviks simultaneously led an uncompromising struggle also against the Centrists, "whose whole policy," as Comrade Stalin says,

"consisted in gilding the opportunism of the 'rights' with 'left' phrases." Comrade Stalin tells us what Centrism is in the following words :

"Centrism is not a conception of space ; in one place, let us say, the 'Right' Wing are sitting, in another the 'Left,' and in the middle the Centrists. Centrism is a political conception. Its ideology is the ideology of adaptation, the ideology of subordinating proletarian interests to the interests of the bourgeoisie."

This tendency has always had as its task the holding of the revolutionary masses in the abyss of opportunism, by means of sham revolutionary words. Its task has been to deceive the masses by more subtle methods than open Menshevism.

Trotsky led this tendency at various times up to 1917 in Russia. In Germany it was led by Kautsky and Bebel. The Centrists were outwardly enemies of opportunism, but in practice tried to reconcile Marxism with opportunism, and were consequently themselves one of the many tendencies of opportunism. So it is perfectly clear that the Bolsheviks could not but fight against this form of opportunism also. Centrism (in Russian conditions Trotskyism) directed its weapon chiefly against revolutionary Marxism, that is against Bolshevism.

The Bolsheviks in the course of their struggle against Russian and International Menshevism which began in 1903, worked at building up a '*Left Wing*' in the Second International. The Russian Bolsheviks occupied the most consistent revolutionary and internationalist position, whereas among the Lefts not all were capable of carrying on a sufficiently energetic and consistent struggle against the leaders of International Social-Democracy. In the pre-war years Rosa Luxemburg, for example, more than once came out together with the Centrists, including Trotsky, against Lenin, putting forward views which had nothing to do with revolutionary Marxism. Lenin sharply criticised the mistakes of Rosa Luxemburg and of other leaders of social-democracy, since these mistakes were echoes of opportunist Menshevik influence.

But Rosa Luxemburg and the left wing in International Social-Democracy had also their revolutionary merits. The Bolsheviks criticised their opportunist mistakes, but strongly supported them in all their revolutionary actions, in their struggle against German and other Mensheviks and Centrists, (particularly during the World Imperialist War, when the leaders of German Social-Democracy and the Second International finally went over to the side of the bourgeoisie). The Bolsheviks pushed the Lefts on to a direct break with the opportunists, calling on them to do as the Russian Bolsheviks had done with regard to the Mensheviks, and showing that the opportunist leaders of German Social-Democracy and of the Second International were agents of the bourgeoisie within the working-class movement.

For a long time before the Imperialist War, Lenin foretold that the opportunists in time of war would betray the working class and stand on the side of the bourgeoisie. In 1907 and 1912 two international congresses of the social-democratic parties which belong to the Second International took place. The congresses adopted resolutions against the support of war, and for its transformation into international revolution.

Lenin warned against over-estimating the "revolutionary character" of the opportunist leaders of the Second International, even though they had

accepted these resolutions. Lenin was convinced that the opportunist section of the International would not undertake an open revolutionary action against the bourgeoisie when war broke out. He knew too well the cowardly breed of these creatures, closely connected as they were with the bourgeoisie, to trust their resolutions. The War of 1914-18 completely confirmed Lenin's forecasts.

V

THE YEARS OF THE IMPERIALIST WAR

The Collapse of the Second International

The World Imperialist War which broke out in the summer of 1914 put all the parties of the Second International to a hard revolutionary test, and the Bolshevik Party alone came through that test. From the very beginning it occupied a militant, revolutionary, *internationalist* position, coming out sharply against the imperialist war and fighting for the transformation of the international slaughter into an international proletarian revolution. All the other social-democratic parties and leaders of the Second International went over to the side of the imperialists, and began to support "their own" bourgeois governments and to call on the workers to participate in the war.

The solemn promises and obligations of the social-democratic parties and all the resolutions of the Second International turned out to be nothing but worthless scraps of paper. The opportunists finally crossed to the side of their imperialist governments and began earnestly calling for the support of the bourgeoisie.

The German Social-Democrats fairly jumped out of their skins in order to prove to their workers that they were bound to fire on the French and Russian workers. The French Socialists convinced their workers that they should go to the front and shoot down German workers. The Russian Mensheviks, led by Plekhanov argued that the Russian, Polish, and other workers and peasants should fight against the German, Austrian, and Turkish workers and peasants. The leaders of the British Labour Movement from Arthur Henderson to Hyndman and MacDonald, became recruiting sergeants for the Government. *The Second International ceased to exist, it fell to pieces.*

The Bolsheviks alone came out unequivocally with an exposure of the imperialist robber character of the war, while a still small group of Lefts supported the Bolsheviks, and together with them comprised the "left wing."

They argued that imperialist wars can only be put an end to through the destruction of capitalism, that is through proletarian revolution. The Bolsheviks therefore called on all social-democrats to transform the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war, to transform the war between peoples into a war of the toilers of each country against their own bourgeoisie.

Attacking all defencist (that section of the opportunists who supported the slogan of "defence of the Fatherland" during the imperialist war) and pacifist theories and speeches, Lenin outlined the point of view of the Bolsheviks on the imperialist war as follows :

"The war is not an accident, not a 'sin,' as the Christian priests believe, but an inevitable stage of capitalism . . . war in our days is

national war. It does not follow from this truth that it is necessary to swim with the 'national' stream of jingoism, but that in wartime and at war, and in a military way, class contradictions dividing the nations will continue to exist and express themselves. Refusal to undertake military service, a strike against war, etc., is simply stupidity, a silly and cowardly dream of unarmed struggle against the armed bourgeoisie, a sigh for the destruction of capitalism without a desperate civil war or series of wars. Propaganda of the class struggle even in wartime is the duty of a socialist, and work directed towards transforming the war of the peoples into a civil war is the only socialist work in the period of an imperialist armed conflict between the bourgeoisie of all nations."

Whilst the Mensheviks were for the *cessation of the class struggle, for civil peace*, with the bourgeoisie, the Bolsheviks on the other hand were for the *continuation and sharpening of the class struggle, for civil war*. Nor could it have been otherwise. The Mensheviks, fulfilling their part as agents of the bourgeoisie, were of course anxious that the bourgeoisie should not have class struggles in its rear. But the Bolsheviks, the party of the revolutionary working class, exposed the treachery of the Mensheviks and called the working class on to the path of revolutionary revolt of the armed workers and peasants against their governments, against the rule of the exploiting classes. The opportunists of all countries "postponed" the revolution for a long time, or rather, came out *against the revolution*. The Bolsheviks on the other hand were for the immediate transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war. The Mensheviks of all types and countries acted as the defenders of the interests of their own nations, that is of the interests of their own national bourgeoisie. The Bolsheviks, on the other hand, remained true to the idea of *revolutionary internationalism*; that is, they called for fraternal mutual revolutionary action, for a united struggle of the working class of all countries in the world against international imperialism. The Bolsheviks called for the working class throughout the whole world to bring about the defeat of its own governments, for the workers to concern themselves not with the frontiers of their bourgeois state, but with the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of their working-class power. This demand arises from the whole revolutionary teaching of Marx and Engels, who more than once declared that "the working class of each separate country must first of all finish with its own bourgeoisie," and that "the proletarians have no fatherland, consequently it is impossible to take away from them what they have not got."

It was not simply those Mensheviks who came out with the open slogan "defence of the Fatherland," but also those who twisted and covered up their treachery with "revolutionary" phrases, who helped with all their power the bourgeoisie to fulfil its plundering robber aims. The Bolsheviks exposed with particular mercilessness the Centrists who were against the war in words but in practice helped the bourgeoisie to carry on their robber war.

Kautsky, the leader of the German Social-Democrats in the Second International, declared at the beginning of the war that it was unnecessary and impossible to form a united front of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, and that therefore in each country each party should act as best it could. In this way he justified the slogan of "defence of the Fatherland."

Covering up his retreat to the side of the imperialist bourgeoisie, Kautsky, in order to deceive the masses, later on made nice little speeches against the

war, but in these speeches was no different from those parsons who preached peace. Trotsky occupied the same position in the question of the war. Lenin mercilessly exposed the whole treacherous, petty-bourgeois essence of the centrist propaganda of peace.

The open opportunist defencists supported their governments in parliament, voted the war budgets, joined the various capitalist governments (most capitalist countries had one or two socialist ministers in their governments), travelled to the front, all in order to help the bourgeoisie to convince the working class soldiers to kill one another and perish themselves.

The Eve of the Second Revolution

While fighting against defencism and centrism, the Bolsheviks never ceased in the difficult circumstances of wartime to carry on revolutionary propaganda among the workers and soldiers, calling on them to overthrow the autocracy by means of armed revolt.

In the middle of 1914 the Tsarist gendarmes broke up all the legal workers' organisations and closed down *Pravda*.

At the commencement of the war a conference of party workers, together with all the Bolshevik members of the Duma (Comrades Petrovsky, Badayev, Samoilov, Muranov, and Shagov) took place. The conference had to work out the question of the struggle against war on the basis of Lenin's theses. All the participators in the conference were arrested. The Tsarist government accused the Bolshevik members of the Duma of betrayal of the fatherland because of their action against the war and exiled them to Siberia. Simultaneously all the active party workers were arrested and exiled, including Comrades Stalin and Molotov.

The police and gendarmes introduced a harsh regime of spying, provocation and treachery. Mass arrests of Bolsheviks were carried out throughout the country.

But in spite of this harsh campaign of the Tsarist police against the Bolsheviks, Tsarism nevertheless did not succeed in destroying the connections of the party with the masses. The party carried on a militant agitation against the imperialist slaughter and for the preparation of revolution. Leaflets, were distributed and personal propaganda went on in the factories, among the reserves, and in the trenches, throughout the whole period of the war.

The Bolsheviks' work became particularly widespread in 1916-17. The war had disorganised the whole economic life of the country, strikes had commenced, desertion from the front was beginning, while military defeats of the Tsarist army were also beginning. Continual treachery and betrayal was taking place in the rear. There were numerous spies in the highest government institutions and even in the Tsar's court. The country was becoming exhausted as a result of the long war. Agriculture, deprived of male labour and of horses, which had all been taken for the front, began to decline. A food crisis set in. Industry and transport were paralysed. Disorganisation paralysed the whole economy of the country. Revolutionary feeling began to rise quickly against this background.

The bourgeoisie was scared by the situation which was created in the country. It tried to make an agreement with the Tsarist autocracy, to convince it that it should bring representatives of industrial capital into the

leadership of the country, together with the nobles and landlords. But it was already too late. The revolution broke out into the open, the old hatred for the Tsarist autocracy grew stormily into open revolutionary revolt of the workers, peasants and soldiers. Numerous strikes and workers' meetings preceded the revolt. The wave of strikes at the beginning of 1917 swept through all the industrial cities of Russia. Meetings were carried on under the slogan of the overthrow of the autocracy and the ending of the war. In many cities mass demonstrations of the workers organised by the Bolsheviks took place. Indignation with the Tsarist regime quickly took on the form of open armed action. The workers armed themselves. The soldiers, sick of the war, and the workers' wives suffering from hunger, appeared on the streets. Barricades sprang up. Street fighting with the police and gendarmes began. The Tsarist government was no longer able to rely on the garrison of Petrograd (the name of the capital had been changed from St. Petersburg to Petrograd at the beginning of the war), which chiefly consisted of soldiers who had grown tired of the war, of mobilised workers and peasants. The bourgeoisie was no longer able to restrain the revolutionary outburst of the masses. The autocracy was overthrown.

VI

FEBRUARY TO OCTOBER

The Period of Dual Power

The February revolution marked the end of a long period of struggle of the masses of the people against Tsarism. In a few days Russia had been changed into a democratic bourgeois republic of which Lenin said in April 1917:

"Of all the countries at war, Russia is now the freest in the world."

The position of the Bolsheviks in their struggle against Menshevism and against that peculiar variety of it known as Trotskyism, was at once justified by the February revolution. The revolutionary revolt of February 1917 was a revolt of the working-class masses, energetically supported by the many millions of the peasantry. The February revolution came as the beginning of an organised alliance of the working class with the peasantry. *The working class was the leading force in the revolution.*

The bourgeoisie, however, was able to use the victory of the workers and peasants who had revolted in their own interests. The Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries helped them in this. They formed the Provisional Government consisting of representatives of factory owners, bankers, merchants and landlord nobility, with Prince Lvov at its head.

The Mensheviks occupied the same position as they had done in 1905. They considered that after the overthrow of the autocracy, power should be transferred into the hands of the bourgeoisie. The Mensheviks assured the workers that the chief motive force of the revolution was the bourgeoisie, although it was quite obvious to the workers that it was they who had overthrown the Tsarist power, that it was they, the working class, supported by the peasantry, who had carried through the revolution. With all their power the Mensheviks helped the bourgeoisie to strengthen their rule,

and consequently to continue the imperialist war on the side of Anglo-French capital.

The Soviets of workers' and soldiers' deputies, which were formed in the first days of the revolution, from the very beginning were in the hands of Mensheviks and S.R.'s. These parties having handed over power to the bourgeoisie, voluntarily assumed the task of organising support for the bourgeois government within the Soviets, but although the Mensheviks at first succeeded in restraining the Soviets from the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie, nevertheless the Provisional Government formed after the revolution was not all-powerful. The Soviets of workers', soldiers' and peasants' deputies, which in a short time had grown up in all the towns, in the army and in the villages, were in fact, a *second power in the country*, alongside the official power.

A position now existed in which in fact there were two powers. One of them, the Provisional Government, was the power of the bourgeoisie; the other, the Soviets, was the power of the workers and peasants. Such a situation could not long continue. Sooner or later one of these two powers would have to triumph. Either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie would have to be finally confirmed, or else the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The February revolution opened up wide legal possibilities for the development of party work. *Party committees developed their work in all the big industrial centres.* *Pravda* began to come out in Petrograd again, edited at first by Comrade Molotov, and then by Comrade Stalin, who had returned from exile. At this time the Bolsheviks and Comrade Stalin both in their newspaper and in the Soviets came out *against* the bourgeois Provisional Government, for the strengthening of the Soviets, for the concentration of all power in their hands. The party declared that the Provisional Government was essentially counter-revolutionary, since it consisted of representatives of the big bourgeoisie and the landlords, and that there could therefore be no agreement with it. Kamenev on the other hand, on his return from exile, published articles calling for the *support* of the Provisional Government.

In the question of the war the party occupied a position for its decisive transformation from an imperialist into a civil war. The party called for the fraternisation of the soldiers at the front. Neither did Kamenev agree with the party on the question of the war, proposing to support the Provisional Government in this matter also. He opposed fraternisation in the trenches. Comrade Stalin mercilessly criticised these views of Kamenev, exposing their opportunist essence.

The party followed not Kamenev but Comrade Stalin, and even before Lenin's return it was finding a correct line. The Bolsheviks' agitation against the war and the decisive exposure of the character of the Provisional Government attracted the attention and sympathy of wide masses of the workers towards the party.

When on the 3rd April, 1917, Lenin returned to Russia after long years of exile, he was welcomed triumphantly by the workers and soldiers of Petrograd.

The next day Lenin put forward his famous "April Theses," which became the *programme of widespread struggle for proletarian dictatorship*. Lenin emphasised in these theses the peculiarities of the position, in which alongside the official bourgeois power there existed the power of the Soviets, which

in practice was realising the *revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry*.

Consequently the chief task of the bourgeois democratic revolution had been fulfilled. *It was now the turn of the next stage, the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and poor peasantry, the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic into the proletarian socialist revolution.*

The demand for the transfer of power to the Soviets was clearly expressed in Lenin's theses.

"Not a parliamentary republic," the theses stated, "a return to that from the Soviets of workers' deputies would be a step backwards, but a republic of Soviets of workers, agricultural labourers' and peasants' deputies, throughout the country from top to bottom."

The theses proclaimed the slogan, "No support for the Provisional Government."

This slogan did not mean that it called at the same time for the immediate overthrow of the Provisional Government. The Soviets, which were based on the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, wielded much greater power than did the Provisional Government, but the Soviets were still in the hands of the Mensheviks and S.R.'s. The masses of workers and soldiers were still following these agents of the bourgeoisie. The slogan "All power to the Soviets" meant a call for struggle for the putting of an end to the *dual power* and for the establishment of a *single* revolutionary power of the workers and peasants. This slogan meant a call to struggle *to win a majority in the Soviets*.

The Struggle for the Majority in the Soviets

The party followed the same course as had been marked out for it during the revolution of 1905. The revolutionary force which the Soviets of workers' and soldiers' deputies represented made it possible to begin, without further long delay, an immediate struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The "right" opportunists in the party, Kamenev, Rykov, Nogin and others, did not at once understand this peculiarity of the situation which had been created. They declared that it was still necessary to carry through the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the end and completely destroy the relics of feudalism before transforming it into a socialist revolution. But this statement was an opportunist under-estimation of the very class nature of the Soviets. Lenin answered these objections as follows:

"The Soviet of workers' and soldiers' deputies, there you have the 'revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry' already existing in real life."

So the Bolshevik Party carried through an energetic struggle to win over the masses under the slogan of "*All power to the Soviets*." The party exposed the imperialist policy of the Provisional Government and of the Mensheviks and S.R.'s who supported it. The Bolsheviks explained to the masses that it was impossible to get peace any other way than by the revolutionary way out of the war, that the bourgeois government was not able to give the workers bread and the peasants land, and that the only power which could give peace, bread and land was the power of the Soviets.

The country was tired of the war. The worker and peasant masses in the rear, and the soldiers at the front were united in demanding peace. The

bourgeois government, and the Mensheviks and S.R.'s who supported it, were preparing to continue the imperialist war. The Provisional Government, which now had the S. R. Kerensky at its head, prepared a new offensive on the Austrian front. This caused threatening indignation among the labouring masses.

The peasantry demanded that the landlords' estates should be handed over to them. But the bourgeois government, supported by the Mensheviks and S.R.'s, refused to take away the landlords' lands, telling the peasantry to wait for the summoning of the Constituent Assembly which, according to them, alone had the authority to solve this question. This in its turn caused revolutionary discontent in the villages and among the soldiers at the front. Lenin outlined the position of the Provisional Government in regard to its relations towards the peasantry in the following way:

"As for the land, wait until the Constituent Assembly. When the Constituent Assembly comes, wait until the end of the war. When the war is over wait for complete victory. That's what it means. The capitalists and landlords, who have their own majority in the government, are simply fooling the peasantry."

The Bolshevik agitation among the masses was causing a very wide movement under the banner of Bolshevism.

The Bolshevik slogans were widespread among the labouring masses and quickly penetrated to the front and into the villages. Under the influence of this agitation the workers and masses of soldiers began to recall the Menshevik and Socialist Revolutionary deputies in the Soviets, and to replace them by Bolsheviks. A powerful move forward of the revolutionary movement began. Everywhere, and especially in the streets and squares of Petrograd, *demonstrations of workers and soldiers under the Bolshevik slogans took place.* At the front the *fraternisation of the Russian soldiers with the Germans and Austrians* was going on. The answer to the order of the Provisional Government for a general offensive on the front on the 18th June, 1917, was an outburst of stormy demonstrations of protest throughout the country under the banners of the Bolsheviks. The masses quickly liberated themselves from Menshevik and S.R. influence and came on to the path of struggle for the proletarian dictatorship.

The Bolshevik Party won a powerful ally in the shape of the revolutionary movement of the National Minorities in the borderlands of the country, particularly in Finland, the Ukraine and White Russia. The Bolshevik programme showed the way to the destruction of national contradictions in Russia and opened up for her numerous peoples the possibility of solving their needs in accordance with their national interests, while co-ordinating these interests with the general class interests of the proletariat.

The Preparation of the Armed Uprising. The October Revolution

On July 3rd, 1917, the workers and soldiers of Petrograd organised an immense demonstration with the demand for the transfer of power to the Soviets. The Mensheviks and S.R.'s who were then at the head of the Soviets decisively opposed the demands of the workers and soldiers, while the Provisional Government, with the blessing of the Menshevik and S.R. leaders of the Petrograd Soviet, fired on the demonstration. Having broken

up the revolutionary organisations of the workers, the Provisional Government proceeded to withdraw from the front Cossack and Guard regiments which were faithful to them. Arrests of the Bolsheviks began. Lenin was forced to go into hiding, so that he could continue to lead the struggle of the party and proletariat to power. The editorial offices of *Pravda* were smashed up. The death penalty was re-introduced at the front. The Bolshevik Party was now in a semi-legal position, in which, alongside with its work in the Soviets and other working-class organisations, it had to carry on its party struggle by purely underground methods.

In these semi-legal conditions of August 1917, the Sixth Party Congress was called, and played a tremendous role in the preparation for the October revolution. The Congress proceeded under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, who laid down the main lines in the estimation of the immediate situation and in the preparation for the armed revolt.

In his speech against Preobrajensky, who denied that it was possible for the revolution to be victorious in one country alone, Comrade Stalin declared that "Russia is in fact the country which is clearing the way to socialism." These words of Comrade Stalin have been fully and completely confirmed.

Estimating the situation after the July events Lenin wrote : "Dual power has come to an end. The power has passed at the decisive spot into the hands of the counter-revolution." The heroic struggle of the Bolsheviks, the strengthening of their connection with the masses in spite of the persecution of the Kerensky Government, the widespread explanation to the masses of the slogan, "All power to the Soviets," all led to the rapidly increasing influence of the Bolsheviks. In Moscow the majority of the trade unions passed into the hands of the Bolsheviks. In Petrograd the Bolshevik wing in the Soviets grew stronger every day.

The bourgeois government could not but be disturbed by this. At the same time discontent was growing in the ranks of the bourgeois counter-revolution itself against the Provisional Government, which in the opinion of these circles, was incapable of suppressing the growing proletarian revolution. These reactionary circles, at whose head stood the old generals, Kornilov, Kaledin, and others, perceived the growing influence of the Bolsheviks inside the Soviets, and therefore prepared to strike first of all at the Soviets.

The counter-revolutionary revolt which General Kornilov started at the end of August aimed at putting an end to the Soviets and finally reinforcing the semi-dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. But the revolt was decisively smashed by the workers and soldiers under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party.

The slogan of arming the proletariat which the party raised in connection with Kornilov's counter-revolutionary rising, led to the beginning of the formation everywhere of workers' detachments, to the organisation of a workers' *Red Guard*. The masses of workers finally saw through the cowardly counter-revolutionary character of the Mensheviks and S.R.'s, and began to drive them out of the Soviets, sending back only Bolsheviks in their place. This growth of the confidence of the masses in the Bolshevik Party and its slogans resulted in both the *Petrograd and Moscow Soviets being already in the hands of the Bolsheviks* by September 1917. The Bolsheviks had a majority in both these Soviets.

The time had consequently come for the Bolsheviks to lead the masses of

workers and peasants to the conquest of power, to the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship.

"Having got a majority in the Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies," Lenin wrote from his underground hiding place, "the Bolsheviks can and should take State power into their own hands."

Lenin finished this letter of his with the following words :

"By taking power at once in both Moscow and Petrograd (it doesn't matter in which we begin ; perhaps it can begin in Moscow even), we shall undoubtedly and unconditionally win."

September and October of 1917 were months of energetic preparation of the masses for a revolt against the counter-revolutionary government of Kerensky. The working class of Petrograd and Moscow and of the industrial centres quickly armed itself and prepared for the seizure of power. At the front the soldiers threw the Mensheviks and S.R.'s out of the army committees and elected Bolsheviks in their place. In the country a spontaneous seizure of the landlords' land was taking place. In a great number of peasants' Soviets voices were being raised against the S.R.'s and for the Bolsheviks, for the slogan : "Peace, bread and land."

The Bolshevik Military Revolutionary Committee formed on the 26th October, 1917, occupied all the important points in Petrograd with those soldiers who had come over to the side of the proletarian revolution and with the forces of the Red Guard. The Red Guards and sailors occupied the telephone exchange, then the post office and telegraph station. Kerensky betook himself to the Winter Palace where the Provisional Government also took refuge with the officers, military cadets and women's battalions. From all the suburbs of Petrograd, the Provisional Government summoned troops to fight against the Bolsheviks. But the Bolshevik agitators held up these forces on all the roads, and they either went over to the side of the Bolsheviks or returned to their barracks. On 7th November, 1917, the Winter Palace, after an obstinate struggle, was occupied by the Red Guard and detachments of workers, and the Provisional Government was overthrown. Power was transferred to the hands of the working class. The same day the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets was convened. The Bolsheviks had a majority at the Congress. The Congress declared the Provisional Government overthrown and elected the first Council of People's Commissars, at whose head was Lenin.

The victory of the proletarian revolution had simultaneously and incidentally, finally, completed and finished off the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Lenin later declared that a "side-product" of the November revolution was that it had put an end to all the relics of the Tsarist feudal system in a most decisive manner. The November revolution put an end to the property of the landlords, princes and the church, and drove a stake through the whole monarchist, Tsarist system, finishing off all that inequality and lack of rights which are connected with a monarchist regime. It put an end to the existence of the estates (that is the division of the people into aristocracy and ordinary people, into nobles, peasants, members of guilds, etc.), put an end to the relics of feudal exploitation in the country, to the absence of sex equality in law and the oppression of women, to the pre-eminent position of the official church and religion, to the inequality of nationalities and so on. Not one single bourgeois revolution in Europe has brought to completion these

tasks of every bourgeois-democratic revolution. Why? Because, as Lenin said: "They were prevented by 'respect' towards 'sacred private property.' There was none of this damnable 'respect' towards this three times damned medievalism, and towards this 'sacred private property' in our proletarian revolution."

The Russian revolution started a general advance of the international proletarian revolution. A group of "right" wing Communists led by Kamenev and Rykov denied that it was possible to have a successful proletarian revolution in Russia. Like the Mensheviks, they considered that a proletarian revolution in Russia which took place before the revolution had been victorious in the Western European countries would be "an adventure," that is to say a cause which was doomed to failure. The "right" wing went against Lenin's teaching on the proletarian revolution, on the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the proletarian, on the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country. So they came out against the slogans of the Bolshevik Party, "Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Poor Peasantry," and "All power to the Soviets."

On the very eve of the November revolution, Zinoviev also joined Kamenev. They were against the Soviets taking power, and for the creation of a joint government with the Mensheviks and S.R.'s.

Lenin, Stalin, and the whole Central Committee fought decisively against this strike-breaking position of Kamenev and Zinoviev. These cowardly "leaders" began to attack the party in the non-party press (the newspaper *New Life*) and blabbed about the preparation for revolt by the Bolshevik Party. They behaved shamefully at the very moment of the November revolution. They left their posts and simply deserted. This of course, was treachery. To leave the front of revolutionary struggle at the hottest moment of the class fight is the act of cowards, but not of working-class leaders. The party sternly condemned the behaviour of these poor-spirited leaders. Lenin even demanded their expulsion from the party. This apostasy of Kamenev and Zinoviev, which, as Lenin afterwards emphasised, at the end of 1923 just before his death, was not accidental and arose from their opportunist nature, of course did not at all weaken the decisiveness of the Bolshevik Party.

"If hesitating leaders get out at such a time, that does not weaken, but strengthens the party, the working-class movement and the revolution," Lenin afterwards wrote.

Thanks to the heroism of the proletariat and the village poor the November revolution, under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, was victorious and established the dictatorship of the working class.

The whole history of proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union is a clear refutation of the counter-revolutionary prophecies of the Mensheviks and of the capitulatory views of Zinoviev and Kamenev.

VII

THE YEARS OF THE CIVIL WAR

The Brest Peace

The first decrees of the Soviet Power established workers' control over production, destroyed private property in land, put the banks, railways, etc., into the hands of the proletarian State, declared that steps for the immediate conclusion of peace would be taken and defined the political character of the new system in a special "declaration of rights of the toilers and exploited" These first decrees all of them at once defined the *socialist* character of the October revolution, and the establishment of a new State system in the Soviet Power.

The Soviet Power smashed all the relics of the former Tsarist landlord State apparatus, and in its place created its own apparatus of proletarian dictatorship.

From the very first days of the dictatorship of the working class, the Soviet Power encountered immense political and economic difficulties.

Not only the dispossessed ruling classes but the whole mass of their hirelings and servants, the bank officials and civil servants, the employees, military cadets and officers, as well as the political hirelings and servants of the bourgeoisie, the Mensheviks and S.R.'s, carried on a fierce attack against the Soviet Power by means of sabotage and by breaking the laws of the new power and also through open armed action against the power of the Soviets. The dispossessed classes of course could not and did not wish to be reconciled to their position and began a civil war against the Soviet Power. In the Don region, in the Ukraine, in Orenburg, in Siberia, in Finland, the capitalists and landlords supported by the Mensheviks and S.R.'s formed White Guard detachments which, under the command of the Tsarist Generals Kaledin, Krasnov, Dutov, Skoropadsky and others, organised a military front of counter-revolutionary struggle against the proletarian dictatorship.

The Soviet Power did not yet have its own army. It could only make use of the detachments of the Red Guard and those revolutionary forces of the Petrograd and Moscow garrisons which had participated in the revolutionary seizure of power in November. The military forces at the front were tired of war. Spontaneous demobilisation of the army took place.

The national economy of the country was ruined by the long imperialist war. The position with regard to food was exceedingly serious. Agriculture was declining, industry was dying, transport was in a condition of collapse.

The chief task of the party in this period was to smash the resistance of the class enemy, to maintain the power of the Soviets, to create an apparatus of the Soviet State, to build up its military power, to learn how to administer the State, to organise the administration of industry and of the whole of national economy without the property owners and exploiters.

The chief difficulty was deciding the question of how to get out of the imperialist war. The day after the seizure of power the Second Congress of Soviets had already passed a decree of peace. The Soviet Power appealed to all the peoples and governments of the countries at war to enter into peace negotiations. But the English, French and other imperialists refused to

negotiate. So the Soviet Government had to begin negotiations with Germany and Austria alone.

The German imperialists imposed very heavy conditions of peace on Soviet Russia. The question as to whether these demands should be accepted or refused caused serious disagreements inside the party.

The negotiations took place at Brest and in the struggle around the Brest Peace there was shown particularly clearly the so-called "revolutionary," but in essence petty-bourgeois, character of "left" Communism.

The "left" Communists, led by Comrades Bukharin, Radek, Piatakov, Yarsoslavsky, Uritsky, Ossinsky and others, attacked Lenin, Stalin and the majority of the Central Committee. This group formed its own fraction inside the party. They considered the Brest Peace was an impermissible concession to German imperialism from the revolutionary party of the working class. The group demanded the declaration of a revolutionary war, despite the fact that there was no possibility of fighting, and above all that there was no army. The "left" Communists considered it was impermissible for revolutionaries to accept peace at the hands of the German imperialists and preferred "a noble death in battle" to this shame.

But Lenin mocked sternly at these childish "lefts," showing that it was not a matter of perishing, even nobly, but of giving the country peace even though a terrible one, of gaining time, of saving the revolution, so as to be able once again to start a revolutionary offensive. Lenin, as during the most difficult years of the struggle against Tsarism, was not afraid of hard and thankless work on behalf of the revolution, while the "left" Communists did not have the strength to undertake such work, to overcome the temporary difficulties, and could not prevent their spirits falling in defeat.

Trotsky, who had joined the Bolshevik Party before the November revolution, held a confused position, though in essence he acted together with the "lefts," and inspired them in their struggle against Lenin and Stalin. He put out the slogan, "Neither war nor peace." This slogan meant, refuse to sign the peace, while not carrying on the war and dispersing the army. Lenin showed that Trotsky's position must lead to even worse peace conditions.

"If the Germans begin an offensive," Lenin warned, "then we shall have to sign any kind of a peace, which of course will be worse." The "left" Communists agreed with Trotsky on this question and things turned out as Lenin had foreseen. German imperialism began its offensive, advancing almost without any resistance, since the front had already practically disappeared. The Soviet Power was forced to accept new and even worse conditions of peace, dictated by German imperialism.

The party rejected the demands of the "left" Communists. It knew that this concession from a proletarian revolution to world imperialism was a compulsory one, inevitable at the time when there was neither army, nor funds, nor munitions, nor food for further war against Germany. Nevertheless the "left" Communists carried on an attack on the party and practically made a united front with the "left" S.R.'s, a kulak party, which was dressed up in "revolutionary" clothes. The "left" Communists refused to obey the Central Committee and prepared to split the party.

Thanks to the Brest Peace, Soviet Russia got a breathing space and used it to create its own Red Army and the conditions for socialist construction. Afterwards, having strengthened the proletarian dictatorship, the Soviet

Power was able to break the heavy conditions of the peace which the German generals and imperialists had forced on it.

The "left" Communists then recognised that the party had been right. They recognised that they would have destroyed the revolution if their fraction had been victorious in the question of the peace.

Military Communism

The struggle for the firm establishment of the working-class dictatorship went on in conditions of stern civil war. The whole of world imperialism stood by the overthrown classes in Russia, and sent their troops and battle-ships against the land of the Soviets.

The civil war went on in circumstances of general economic collapse after the four years of imperialist slaughter, in which the country had expended all its reserves of iron, food, fuel, textiles, etc., worn out its transport and ruined its industry. The country was hungry. The factories and mills were silent.

The workers and peasants had to face the splendidly trained White Guard armies, consisting almost wholly of officers. These counter-revolutionary armies were well-armed, well-clothed and shod, well supplied with food. The world capitalist class had armed and supplied them.

The workers' and peasants' Red Army created in the fire of the civil war was ragged and barefoot. It made tremendous marches across the vast spaces of the country, often with only shoes of bark or even without any kind of footwear at all. Sometimes it had to fight without shells or cartridges. The workers and peasants retreated and attacked shoulder to shoulder in the Red Army, suffered privations together, fought heroically together against the White Guard officers and generals, took from them their English uniforms and boots, captured with their bare hands the White Guard tanks and armoured trains, took their well-fed horses and with them strengthened the Red Cavalry.

In the rear the workers in the half-ruined factories, freezing for lack of fuel and metal, heroically helped the front, making shells, cartridges, great coats, etc.

The fighting enthusiasm of the masses of workers was unparalleled. In conditions of terrible privation and difficulties of food supplies, the workers fought with all their might in order to prevent the factories coming to a standstill, and the army being left without munitions. In the course of the struggle of the workers for fuel, for improving the functioning of transport and of the factories, the Communist Saturdays were born, of which Lenin said they were the expression "of the heroism of the workers in the rear," and the manifestation "of the free and conscious discipline of the toilers themselves." On these Communist "Saturdays" the workers voluntarily gave up their spare time to getting fuel, unloading trucks, cleaning up factories, repairing locomotives and so on.

At the front and in the rear the peasantry supported the working class in their fight against the bourgeoisie and the landlords. And so the peasantry gave bread and cattle for feeding the Red Army and for the maintenance of the city workers producing munitions for the front.

The civil war went on for over three years. During all this time the country experienced the most serious deficiency of goods and provisions. Bread, meat,

clothes, boots, almost nothing of these remained in the country. So that the small reserves which there were should not be frittered away and leave the army and the State without supplies and munitions, it was necessary to take stock of everything there was in the country, and to distribute it in extremely meagre portions. Both the peasantry and especially the working class deprived themselves of much that was necessary in order not to damage the struggle of the Red Army, in order to give it the chance of victory.

This was the period when all products and goods had to be rationed *very strictly*. Their distribution was accomplished by State organisations according to fixed rations. All kinds of trading were forbidden. The peasantry gave up its grain to the State on a basis of equal division. The State took from the peasant farms the whole of the grain which the farm produced, apart from what was needed for the farm itself to keep the peasant's family, for his cattle and for seed. This period was known under the name of *Military Communism*.

The peasantry consciously bore the burdens of the civil war, assuming as its chief task victory over the counter-revolution of the generals and landlords. The whole economy of the country was put to the service of this one task, *the organisation of victory*. Both production and distribution were subordinated to this task. All distribution was centralised. There was no distribution at all through the market.

This system was entirely caused by the military situation, by the military political task of the Soviet Power.

So the *military political alliance of the workers and peasants against counter-revolution*, against the re-establishment of Tsarism and capitalism, was formed and strengthened in the stern, exhausting, civil war for the defence of the Soviet Power and the maintenance of the power of the proletariat.

The whole activity of the party at this time was completely directed towards the crushing of the counter-revolution. All the best forces of the party were in the army. Comrades Stalin, Frunze, Voroshilov, Ordjonikidze and many of the present leaders on the economic front were at the front during the civil war, at the head of the armies, inspiring their heroic manœuvres, their battles, their victories.

The great organising force of the party was able to strengthen in the difficult conditions of continual struggle and privation the military and revolutionary energies of the workers and peasants, who were fighting with a united front in the positions of the civil war.

VIII

THE RESTORATION PERIOD

The Transition to N.E.P.

The working class and peasantry smashed the counter-revolution of the bourgeoisie and landlords and the foreign interventionists. But the civil war greatly exhausted the land of the Soviets and still more damaged the national economy, already broken down by the imperialist slaughter. So after the victory over the forces of internal and international counter-revolution, the

chief task was the *restoration* of national economy. It was necessary to restore industry, to restore transport, and to restore agriculture also. Of course the chief thing was to build up industry, and in the first place heavy industry.

It had been impossible even to think about the restoration of industry in the period of civil war.

"The restoration of industry," Lenin said, "could not even be thought about when there was not even a minimum guarantee of either food or fuel. Just to keep together what was left of industry so that the workers did not altogether disperse, to have an army, that was the task which we set ourselves, and it was impossible to solve it any other way than by the equal dividing of the peasants' produce without payment."

But after the victorious ending of the civil war, the chief task of the party became precisely the restoration of industry and of national economy as a whole. For the restoration of economy the policy of equal division was no longer suitable. Neither was this policy suitable in the new conditions for the preservation and strengthening of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry.

The rapid restoration of big industry was essential both for economic and political reasons. Only by restoring and then developing big industries would it be possible to lift up and reconstruct agriculture also on a socialist basis. On the other hand, only on the basis of the restoration and development of big industry was it possible to guarantee the economic co-operation (*smychka*) between town and country, and on this new basis strengthen the alliance of the workers and peasants which had been created in the fire of the civil war.

Lenin in 1921 said with regard to this that in a country like Russia, where the proletariat is in the minority, and where the majority is petty-bourgeois, "the chief task . . . is the correct definition and carrying out of those measures which are essential for the leadership of the peasantry, for a firm alliance with it, for a long series of gradual transitions to *large-scale* socialised machine agriculture."

But in order to show the advantages of this, it was necessary first of all to restore industry, it was necessary to guarantee the production of a large quantity of industrial goods and to develop the circulation of commodities, trade.

The villages needed clothes, boots, sugar, soap, all kinds of manufactured goods. The towns, in addition to this, needed bread, flour, meat, all kinds of supplies and products. It was necessary to create some kind of interest among the peasants in sowing better and more. This could only be achieved by abolishing the policy of equal division which gave no economic stimulus towards increasing the sown area. Equal division took away from the peasant all his grain above what he needed for his own consumption, for food, forage and sowing. It created no interest among the peasants in widening the sown area and increasing the harvest.

The State had to satisfy all the consumption and production needs of the village. It had to give it in the form of State supplies, leather goods, dresses, shirts, trousers, caps, boots, nails, shovels, carts, etc. But the State did not have enough of these things and it could not guarantee the whole hundred-million mass of peasantry the goods which it needed. So the production of these goods had to be developed in every way, both through State industry

and handicraft co-operation, and by private production. Trade had to be re-established, in order to increase exchange between town and country.

The party went over to a new economic policy which has become known under the name of N.E.P. Food division was replaced by a *food tax*. The difference between the food tax and food division consisted in this, that the peasant farm no longer gave to the State all its grain above its own personal and economic needs, but only a part of it, according to an amount established by tax. The rest of the grain was the private property of the peasant and he had the opportunity of taking it to the market for sale. But in order that the peasant should bring his grain to the market, there had to be industrial goods on the market. And in order that there should be industrial goods in sufficient quantity, it was necessary to raise the production of metal, coal, oil, etc., above all, to raise the production of heavy industry. Moreover, it was necessary to produce agricultural machines and tools, threshers, ploughs, etc. *So the party, overcoming great difficulties, gradually set in motion the machines of State industry.* Simultaneously, handicraft industry also began to work for the supplementary production of goods for consumption. The economic connection between town and country was established and developed through *trade*.

N.E.P. was the means of raising the interest of the peasant in his own farm. The sown area began to grow, the quantity of raw material for industry increased, and in this way the conditions for reviving the work of the mills and factories were created. National economy, ruined in the period of imperialist and civil war, began gradually to get on its feet and overcome its collapse.

N.E.P. was introduced in 1921. This policy meant that the proletarian State held in its hands the whole of large-scale industry, banks, transport and foreign trade. Alongside this, private capital was permitted in trade and petty industry. Comrade Stalin has given in the following words a quite exhaustive explanation of what N.E.P. is :

“ N.E.P. is a particular policy of the proletarian State which is calculated on allowing capitalism, while holding in the hands of the proletarian State the commanding positions; which is calculated on the struggle between the capitalist and the socialist elements; which is calculated on the growth of the part played by the socialist elements, to the detriment of the capitalist elements; which is calculated on the victory of the socialist elements over the capitalist elements; which is calculated on the destruction of classes, on the building of the foundation of socialist economy.”

With the introduction of N.E.P. there began a competition between the capitalist and socialist elements, that very competition which Lenin summed up in the words “ which will conquer which ? ”

The advantages on the side of the working class consisted *firstly*, the most important, that they had power in their hands ; *secondly*, that in their hands they had the monopoly of foreign trade, which cut off their economic system from the influence of foreign capital ; *thirdly*, that the working class held large-scale industry in their hands, and consequently there was no need to fear any growth of private capital in large-scale industry ; *fourthly*, the proletarian State had in its hands every possibility of influencing the markets. It could fix prices, it could act with masses of industrial goods, it held credit in its hands, the taxation system, and so on. With the correct policy of the

party these advantages eventually led to the victory of the socialist elements in national economy over the capitalist.

The party by means of N.E.P. successfully solved the following tasks :

Between 1922 and 1926 it restored industry, raised agriculture and on this basis, in the new conditions, strengthened the alliance of the working class and peasantry, created conditions for the wide development of industrialisation. On the basis of N.E.P. not only was national economy restored, but the conditions for new construction were guaranteed, for the fundamental reconstruction of all sections of the country's economy. In this way the transition to the *reconstruction period* of socialist construction was prepared.

The Struggle for the Line and Unity of the Party

The party carried through the transition to N.E.P. and completed the whole period of restoration of national economy in conditions of obstinate struggle against numerous oppositional deviations and groupings within its own ranks.

The party carried through the change from the period of civil war to economic construction. This transition was particularly difficult in conditions of general economic exhaustion, and it was accompanied by discontent and hesitation of the town and village petty-bourgeoisie, and by kulak risings against the Soviet Power. Such risings took place in Siberia, in the former province of Tambov, and in the Ukraine. In March of 1921 a counter-revolutionary revolt broke out in Kronstadt.

This elemental petty-bourgeois mass weighed upon the working class and the unstable sections within the Communist Party, making it possible to form various anti-party deviations and groupings.

On the eve of the Ninth Congress of the party in 1920, a group had already been formed which called itself "*The Group of Democratic Centralism*," at whose head was Sapronov. This group attacked the centralised leadership of the struggle of the working class. Attacking the organisational structure of the party and the leadership of the Central Committee, this group opposed the Soviets to the party under the slogan of: "No interference of the party in the work of the Soviets." This group afterwards participated, together with the Trotskyist opposition, in every anti-party movement right up to 1925-27 and ended up by degenerating into an ordinary counter-revolutionary organisation.

In 1921 on the eve of the Tenth Party Congress, a number of fractional groupings was formed, which attacked the line of the Central Committee over the question of the role of the trade unions and the organisational policy of the party. The discussion which broke out on the eve of the Tenth Congress over the trade unions, expressed the necessity of that change in the economic policy of the party which found its expression in the transition to N.E.P.

In this discussion Trotsky and Bukharin fought against Lenin, Stalin and the majority of the party. It was at this time that the group of the so-called "Labour Opposition" was formed which was led by Shlyapnikov, Medvedyev, and Kollontai. This grouping came forward with clearly anti-party, petty-bourgeois views, representing a mixture of anarchism and Menshevism. This grouping several times later produced its anti-party programmes. Throughout the whole of the years of the restoration period, Trotsky and his

fellow thinkers Preobrajensky, Rakovsky, Sosnovsky and others attacked the line and leadership of the party with particular force. Trotsky in 1923 attacked the Central Committee and the whole party, preaching clearly Menshevik views on the question of the organisational structure of the party, slandering the old Bolshevik Guard and attempting to set the party youth against them.

In the following years Trotsky developed a disorganising destructive work inside the party, insisting on freedom for the formation of fractions and groupings and breaking the discipline of the party. Together with his fraction he put forward a number of economic and political programmes which were aimed at the very foundations of the Bolshevik policy of the party. In January 1925 the Plenum of the Central Committee, and the Control Commission, declared in its resolution that "Trotsky has already begun a direct campaign against the foundations of the Bolshevik outlook." Every day the attacks of Trotsky on the party and its Leninist Central Committee became more and more hostile. The chief of the views of the Trotskyist opposition was that it rejected the socialist character of Soviet construction and argued the impossibility of building socialism in one country. Zinoviev and Kamenev united with Trotsky in this question, and together with him formed a united oppositional bloc. The united opposition carried on bitter attacks against the political line and organisational unity of the party, and against its Leninist leadership at whose head was Comrade Stalin. It broke party discipline, attempted to split the ranks of the party, tried by underground means to create a party within a party. It formed its own illegal committees with their own membership dues, their fractional discipline, etc.

It had its own illegal underground printing plant. On the 7th November, 1927, the Trotskyists tried to organise a counter-revolutionary demonstration which was broken up by the workers. In this way the Trotskyists showed the class enemy what were the organisational forms of counter-revolutionary struggle against the party and the Soviet Power.

With Bolshevik mercilessness the party smashed this fraction, which had degenerated into an open counter-revolutionary force, and threw the Trotskyists out of the party. Trotskyism began afterwards to fight actively against the country of proletarian dictatorship, standing in the front ranks of the enemies of the Soviet Power and becoming the advance guard of the bourgeois counter-revolution.

The Trotskyists concealed their counter-revolutionary attacks on the party with "left" programmes. This was the usual effort of Trotskyism to conceal its full-blooded Menshevik character with false, outwardly "revolutionary," petty-bourgeois theories and phrases. The Trotskyist programmes were full of mistrust in the strength of the working class, in its capacity to lead the peasantry along the path of socialist construction. Trotskyism, while denying the possibility of building socialism in the U.S.S.R. and shouting out about the economic and technical backwardness of the country, rushed into extremes of "*super-industrialism*,"* trying to push the party into a break with the main middle-class mass of peasantry. It is therefore quite natural that in this period (1925-26), the chief danger to the party was "from the

* These shouts about super-industrialisation did not stop the Trotskyists from afterwards occupying an openly counter-revolutionary position which Comrade Stalin characterised as "pitiful minimalism," that is, complete renunciation of a rapid rate of industrialisation. (Further details of this are given in the next part.)

left" and therefore the party waged a particularly bitter struggle against the "left" danger.

But the party clearly saw the presence of right opportunist hesitations also within its ranks. The party condemned the slogan "enrich yourselves," which Comrade Bukharin put forward at this time, and got him to renounce this clearly incorrect anti-Leninist slogan. The party also condemned the theory put forward by Comrade Bukharin's followers and pupils, Slepkov and others, of the "extension of N.E.P." which in fact would have meant a policy of concessions to the kulak and of retreat along the path of capitalist development of economy.

IX

THE RECONSTRUCTION PERIOD

The Party in the Struggle for Industrialisation and Collectivisation

Having restored national economy, the party and the working class proceeded to its fundamental reconstruction. The Fifteenth All-Union Conference of the party which took place in October-November 1926, defined the tasks of the party in the sphere of further development of national economy as follows :

"With the completion of the restoration period, the further development of national economy is prevented by the insufficiency and backwardness of the technical and productive basis inherited from bourgeois society. . . .

"All the efforts of the party and the Soviet State must be directed in the first place towards guaranteeing such an extension of basic capital* as should guarantee the gradual reconstruction of the whole of national economy on a higher technical basis.

"It is essential to aim at overtaking in what should be the minimum possible historical period necessary, and finally at surpassing, the level of industrial development of the advanced capitalist countries."

These tasks arose directly out of the economic achievements of the restoration period, which allowed the party quite decisively to put as its immediate aim the industrialisation of the country, the reconstruction of industry, of transport, and of national economy as a whole.

The tasks placed before the party and the country after the restoration of national economy, were already very clearly expressed at the end of 1925 in the decisions of the Fourteenth Congress of the party. This Congress has gone down in the history of the party as *the Congress of the industrialisation of the country*.

In the resolution on Comrade Stalin's report, the chief economic tasks of the party were expressed as follows :

"At the corner-stone must be placed the task of guaranteeing completely the victory of socialist economic forms over private capital . . . of guaranteeing the economic independence of the U.S.S.R., which will

* That is factories, mines, machines, equipment, etc.

guard the U.S.S.R. from being transformed into a tributary of capitalist world economy, for which reason a course must be steered to the industrialisation of the country."

These tasks form the programme of the whole of the following period of socialist construction and lay at the basis of the Five Year Plan which was adopted by the Fifteenth Party Congress in December 1927. Comrade Stalin defined the importance of this Congress in the following words :

" The Fifteenth Congress was chiefly a congress of *collectivisation*. It was a preparation for the general offensive."

In two and a half years' time (in June-July 1930) the Sixteenth Party Congress took place which has gone down in the history of the party as " a Congress of general offensive of socialism along the whole front, of liquidation of the kulaks as a class and the carrying into life of complete collectivisation." (Stalin.)

This general offensive was prepared by the whole policy of the party which was carrying through the industrialisation of the country.

The party fought for the industrialisation of the country with Bolshevik obstinacy, overcoming on the one hand the harmful counter-revolutionary theories of the Trotskyist "super-industrialists" (who were calling for the breaking of the alliance of the working class and village poor with the middle-class peasantry, which would have meant the breakdown of the dictatorship of the proletariat) and on the other hand, resistance to the policy of industrialisation from the right wing deviationists who at this time were openly attacking the party. The leaders of the right opposition were Comrades Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky. A number of workers in the Moscow organisation led by its then secretary, Uglanov, supported them.

The "right" wing expressed in its views the resistance of the kulaks to the policy of an offensive on the capitalist elements. The leaders of the right deviation were frightened by the difficulties of the industrialisation of the country and the development of collectivisation in the village. So the right opposition came out *against* the policy of industrialisation of the country. The right opposition demanded the development in the first place of industry producing goods for consumption, and proposed to begin industrialisation from the "cotton goods end." This would have meant *strengthening the economic dependence of the U.S.S.R. on the capitalist world*, since machines, chemical manures, tractors, aeroplanes, etc., would have had to be obtained from capitalist countries. (This will be dealt with in more detail in the next part.) The right opposition attacked the rapid rate of industrialisation and proposed to take the pace from the "difficult places."

The party carried through a policy of *strengthening* the offensive on the capitalist elements. The right opposition demanded the *renunciation* of the offensive on the kulak and preached class peace, declaring that the kulak will himself "grow into socialism."

The party carried through a policy of the *construction of powerful Soviet farms*, State factories of grain and meat. The right opposition *attacked* this policy. The party steered its course towards the extension of collectivisation, the right opposition was against the construction of Soviet farms and collective farms, and in fact was dragging the party and the country towards the *development of kulak exploitation in the villages*. The party was fighting for the development of large-scale *socialised* economy. The right

opposition was fighting for the development of large-scale *kulak* economy. The party was fighting for the *socialist* reconstruction of the villages. The right opposition was fighting for the strengthening of the *capitalist* elements in the villages.

Like every other opposition the right deviation tried to form a special fraction within the party. It attacked the line of the party, its Central Committee and Comrade Stalin, who were waging war with Leninist implacability against the right wing opportunist theories and attacks. The leaders of the right opposition worked out their own programme in which they repeated the Trotskyist slanders on the party and on the inner party regime. Like the Trotskyists they tried to split the party and to break its discipline.

In conditions where the kulaks and all the capitalist elements were bitterly resisting the offensive of socialism, the right opposition reflected this resistance within the Communist Party, and acted as a direct defender of the interests of the kulak and the dying exploiting classes. Therefore, *in these conditions the chief danger for the party became right opportunism.*

The party mercilessly smashed the right opposition, the agency of the kulaks. The working class took up the party policy with enthusiasm as did all the labouring masses. As an answer to the wretched forecasts of the right opportunists on the unreality of the party programme of industrialisation, and of the impossibility of fulfilling the pace outlined in the Five Year Plan, the working class itself brought forward the slogan "*The Five Year Plan in Four Years,*" and afterwards brilliantly fulfilled this slogan.

On the basis of the first successes of the reconstruction period which led to a rapid development of the construction of socialist industry and to the socialist reorganisation of agriculture, the party developed the general offensive of socialist construction along the whole front, both in town and country. Despite the desperate resistance of the capitalist classes, despite the open and concealed resistance of the right opportunists, the party succeeded in creating a powerful heavy industry during the first Five Year Plan. (The details of this will be told in the next part.)

The collective farm system was victorious in the country. *Both town and country became firmly fixed on the path of socialism.* The struggle between the capitalist and socialist elements ended in the decisive victory of the latter. *The question "which will conquer which?" was finally solved in favour of socialism.* On the basis of the general victories of socialist construction and in particular of the victory of the collective farm system in the country, the last serious capitalist class, the kulaks, has been smashed, and on the basis of complete collectivisation is being successfully liquidated as a class. (This will be described in detail in the next part.)

But the kulaks are not yet completely beaten. They are still savagely resisting socialist construction. Relics of the beaten classes are trying in various ways to sabotage, smash and break up socialist construction. In such conditions *the chief danger will continue to be right opportunism.* It is the direct assistant and agent of those relics of the hostile classes which are resisting and harming the construction of socialism.

But the party does not for one moment cease to struggle against the manifestations of "left" opportunism, against attempts to carry through collectivisation by simple administrative orders and commands, against efforts to

jump over the *artel** form of the collective farm and against other distortions which lead to breaking the confidence of the peasant masses in the working class and to weakening the working-class leadership over the socialist reconstruction of the village.

Firmly carrying through the well-tryed Leninist policy of struggle on two fronts the Bolshevik Party is victoriously developing the fight for the complete destruction of classes and of relics of class society, for the creation of a classless socialist system.

And so we see from the fourth part that the path which the Bolshevik Party has covered is a glorious path of heroic struggle for Communism carried on by the greatest revolutionary working-class party in the world.

This path has led through the harshest persecution of the Tsarist police, through prison, exile, penal servitude and the gallows.

This path has led through the heavy trials of the civil war, famine, privation, unheard of efforts, struggle and brilliant victories.

This has been a path of merciless war against Russian and international Menshevism in all its varieties and manifestations.

This has been a path of implacable struggle against opportunist deviations within the ranks of the party, both from open opportunism (right wing), and from false petty-bourgeois "revolutionism" ("left" deviation), a path of decisive struggle for the iron unity of the party in ideas and organisation.

This has been a path of victorious development from a small illegal underground party of working-class revolutionaries, into a party ruling a powerful land which is building up socialism, a country which is realising in practice the dream of all labouring humanity, the construction of classless society.

The working class of the whole world is studying this path. Along this path, in the footsteps of the Bolshevik Party, the advanced ranks of the international working class are marching, the Communist Parties of the whole world.

QUESTIONS FOR STUDY:

1. When and why did the split between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks take place?
 2. How did Bolsheviks and Mensheviks estimate the revolution of 1905?
 3. How did Bolsheviks and Mensheviks estimate the role of the peasantry in the revolution?
 4. What class according to the Bolsheviks should have been the leading force in the revolution of 1905?
- What was the difference in the views of Bolsheviks and Mensheviks on this question? What position did Trotsky occupy in this question?
5. Why did the Bolsheviks in 1905 and 1906 fight for the creation of worker detachments and for the preparation of revolt, and what was the attitude of the Mensheviks towards this?
 6. What was liquidationism and to what period did it belong?
 7. How did Lenin teach the co-ordination of legal and illegal revolutionary struggle? What significance does this experience of the Bolshevik Party have for revolutionary working-class parties to-day?
 8. What Bolshevik newspapers can you mention of the pre-revolutionary period and what was the part played by each in the life of the Bolshevik Party?
 9. What was the line which the Bolshevik Party held and persisted in during the World War? What was the chief slogan of the Bolsheviks during the War of 1914-18.
 10. In what did dual power after the February Revolution consist?
 11. What were the disagreements in the party over the Brest Peace?
 12. What were the questions around which the party fought with Trotskyism in the restoration period?
 13. In what does the reconstruction period differ from the restoration period?
 14. Why is the right deviation the chief danger to-day?

* The *artel* form of collective farming is that stage in which only the land, machinery and working cattle are collectivised, the farmer retaining his own domestic cattle and poultry, etc. (For details see next part.)

SM-IN-THE-20TH-CENTURY---<0172047A---

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



HX 632 A1 W9 no.1490
World communism in the 20th
century.

0172047A MAIN

THIS MODERN WORLD

POLITICAL EDUCATION

A new study course of a popular nature. Ten parts of about 32 pages each. To be issued fortnightly.

The parts are:

1. The Two Worlds.
2. Communism is our Ultimate Aim.
3. The Communist Party.
4. Chief stages in the History of the C.P.S.U.
5. Soviet Industry.
6. Soviet Farming.
7. The Present Tasks of the Proletarian Dictatorship.
8. The National Question.
9. The Communist International.
10. Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin.

MARTIN LAWRENCE Ltd.
33 Great James St., London, W.C.1